arXiv:1504.05259v2 [quant-ph] 6 Apr 2017

Analysis of Wallace's Decision Theoretic Proof of the Born Rule in Everettian Quantum Mechanics

André L. G. Mandolesi
Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Bahia
Salvador-BA, Brazil
E-mail: `andre.mandolesi@ufba.br`

April 7, 2017

Abstract

D. Wallace has presented a formal proof of the Born rule for Everettian Quantum Mechanics, based on a proposal by D. Deutsch using decision theory. We check his concepts and axioms for problems, suggesting possible corrections. His proof was reorganized and clarified, with some flaws being identified and improvements proposed. Parallels with classical decision theory are traced, to dispel the idea that Born weights play the role of Savage's subjective probabilities. Unfortunately, many problems could not be fixed, possibly invalidating his result.

1 Introduction

Despite its successes, Quantum Mechanics still has unsolved conceptual problems, regarding measurements and the wavefunction collapse. Everett's formulation [EI57, DG73], also known as Many Worlds Interpretation, tries to solve them by rejecting the Measurement Postulate, and applying the rest of the usual formalism even to macroscopic systems. In this theory, the quantum state of an observer, after a measurement, is a superposition of different versions of himself, each correlated to one of the results. The wavefunction collapse is only apparent, due to the fact that each version is unaware of the others. This may seem far-fetched, but is a natural consequence of the quantum formalism minus the Measurement Postulate, and actually gives a clearer description of the measurement process than the Copenhagen Interpretation.

But as this formalism solves old problems it creates new ones. The preferred basis problem is how to properly carve classical realities out of the quantum state of a macroscopic system. Decoherence has been proposed as a mechanism to achieve this. The probability problem regards a possible disagreement with experiments. Quantum measurements give probabilistic results, with chances given by the Born rule. As this rule is removed with the Measurement Postulate, and the rest of the formalism is deterministic, it is not clear how to explain the observed probabilities.

To deal with this last problem, D. Deutsch [Deu99] applied decision theory to the Everettian setting. A rational agent, following the Everettian formalism, must decide on bets involving quantum measurements. Deutsch tries to show that quantum symmetries make him decide as if results were probabilistic and followed the Born rule. This received some criticism, which led to increasingly refined arguments, culminating in D. Wallace's formal proof [Wal10, Wal12]. Critics remain unconvinced, questioning some axioms or the meaning of his result, but there has been, so far, no criticism of the proof itself. Some supporters have proposed variations of Wallace's ideas, but no attempts have been made to improve and clarify his formal presentation. We seek to fill such gaps, by giving a detailed analysis of his arguments and proof, showing their weaknesses and, when possible, proposing improvements.

Section 2 reviews the measurement problem, the Everettian formalism, its problems, and some proposed solutions. It includes the results of our analysis [Man17] of Wallace's solution to the preferred basis problem, which lays the foundation for concepts used in his proof of the Born rule. Rationality in an Everettian universe, and the relevance of branchings, are discussed in preparation for the analysis of some axioms.

In section 3, Wallace's concepts, axioms and proof are examined. We provide a new presentation, in an attempt to clarify it, and point out problems that were found, proposing ideas on how to fix some of them. Parallels with classical decision theory are traced, to dismiss the idea that Savage's subjective probabilities are at use. In section 4, this comparison is done in simplified examples, which can also help in grasping the essence of Wallace's proof. Section 5 summarizes the problems found, and assesses the meaning of his result. Appendix A presents classical decision theory, for those unfamiliar with it, as it helps in following Wallace's ideas.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The measurement problem

In the Copenhagen interpretation of Quantum Mechanics (CQM), the Measurement Postulate states that, if a system in a state

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_i c_i \, |i\rangle \, , \tag{1}$$

with $\langle i \mid j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ and $\sum |c_i|^2 = 1$, is measured with respect to the basis $\{|i\rangle\}$, the result will be one (and only one) of the i's, with the state collapsing to the corresponding $|i\rangle$. Also, results are probabilistic, according to the following rule.

Born Rule. *The probability of result i is given by $p_i = w_i$, where w_i is its* Born weight*,*

$$w_i = |c_i|^2 = |\langle i \mid \psi \rangle|^2. \tag{2}$$

This postulate agrees with experimental data, but is conceptually ambiguous. It sets measurements apart from other quantum processes, which obey the deterministic linear Schrödinger equation, but lacks a precise definition of what are measurements. These might be distinguished for involving a classical macroscopic system, like an observer, but if this system's particles obey Schrödinger's equation, how can they collectively produce a nonlinear probabilistic[1] process? And how does the collapse of the quantum state happen? Many attempts have been made to solve this *measurement problem*, such as hidden variables theories, Bohmian mechanics, nonlinear Schrödinger equations, and others, each with its own difficulties [WZ14, Aul00].

This relates to the problem of whether Quantum Mechanics remains valid as systems get bigger, with Classical Mechanics emerging from it. In the usual view, quantum superpositions should not happen at the macroscopic level, lest we observe Schrödinger cats. But nothing in the quantum formalism seems to induce their disappearance in large systems, quite to the contrary. So many physicists consider CQM valid only for microscopic systems, with another theory being needed to explain the quantum-classical transition. This point of view becomes problematic as quantum phenomena are verified at increasingly larger scales, or for research in fields like quantum cosmology. Some see decoherence as an explanation for the emergence of classicality, but it is questionable whether it eliminates superpositions, or merely wipes out interference between their components, which survive nonetheless.

---

[1] Probabilistic even in principle, not simply due to lack of knowledge about the states of the particles.

2.2 Everettian quantum mechanics (EQM)

A solution, proposed by H. Everett III [EI57, DG73], rejects the Measurement Postulate, and applies the rest of the quantum formalism even to macroscopic systems. Evolution is always deterministic, even in measurements, following Schrödinger's equation. It leads to macroscopic superpositions, but also explains why observers do not perceive them. If not for some unsolved problems, it might explain quantum measurements, and provide the missing link between quantum and classical mechanics.

In EQM, a measurement is just entanglement of the measuring device with whatever is being measured. More precisely, a *measuring device* for a basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ of a system is any apparatus, in a quantum state $|D\rangle$, which interacts in such a way that, if the system is in state $|i\rangle$, the composite state evolves as[2]

$$|i\rangle \otimes |D\rangle \quad \longmapsto \quad |i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle\,, \tag{3}$$

where $|D_i\rangle$ is a new state of the device, registering result i. Linearity of Schrödinger's equation implies that, if the system is in state (1), the composite state evolves as

$$|\psi\rangle \otimes |D\rangle = \left(\sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle\right) \otimes |D\rangle \quad \longmapsto \quad \sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle\,. \tag{4}$$

This final state is to be accepted as an actual quantum superposition of macroscopic states. But it will not be perceived as such by an observer looking at the device, as, by the same argument, his state $|O\rangle$ will evolve into a superposition, according to

$$\left(\sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle\right) \otimes |O\rangle \quad \longmapsto \quad \sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle \otimes |O_i\rangle\,,$$

with $|O_i\rangle$ representing a state in which he saw result i. By linearity, each component $|i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle \otimes |O_i\rangle$ evolves independently, as if the others did not exist, as long as interference is negligible. In section 2.4 we show why this assumption may be reasonable.

Everett's interpretation of this final state is that the observer has split into different versions of himself, each seeing a distinct result. Each version evolves as if the initial state had been $|i\rangle \otimes |D\rangle \otimes |O\rangle$, so he does not feel the splitting, nor the existence of his other versions. Each component is called a *world* or a *branch*, and this evolution of one world into a superposition of many is called a *branching process*. So in EQM all possible results of a measurement actually happen, but in different worlds. The observer in state $|O_i\rangle$ only thinks the system has collapsed into $|i\rangle$ because he does not see the whole picture, with all other results and versions of himself.

In this language, $\left(\sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle\right) \otimes |O\rangle = \sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle \otimes |D_i\rangle \otimes |O\rangle$ could be read as saying there are identical copies of the observer, in different worlds, even before he sees the result. This seems to imply measurements cause him (and, ultimately, all Universe) to split instantly, before interactions have time to reach him, violating locality. Worse yet, the whole state is already split in branches before any measurement takes place, as $\left(\sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle\right) \otimes |D\rangle \otimes |O\rangle = \sum_i c_i\,|i\rangle \otimes |D\rangle \otimes |O\rangle$. And it may be split in different ways at the same time, depending on the decomposition basis used for $|\psi\rangle$.

This weirdness is the fruit of bad terminology. We can only say something physical (not a mathematical artifact) happened to the device or observer once their states change. Instead of "worlds that split", a more precise (but cumbersome) description might be "local macroscopic superpositions, which evolve with negligible interference, and gradually spread as new systems interact and get entangled with them".

---

[2] For simplicity, we assume the system remains in state $|i\rangle$, but this is not necessary.

Criticism that a proliferation of worlds violates conservation laws also results from a literal reading, as if branching required new matter and energy to build the worlds. Energy of a superposition is not the sum of energies of its components, and, since branching is governed by Schrödinger's equation, it obeys all conservation laws. So the mean energy remains the same, and what really requires explanation is why we do not observe energy variations in some branches at the expense of others.

Problems plaguing CQM disappear in EQM, but new ones come along, as the *probability problem* and the *preferred basis problem*, described in the next sections. Solving them would put EQM in a better theoretical standing than CQM, and might even reveal some testable difference between them.

2.3 The probability problem

In EQM, any result i with $c_i \neq 0$ is obtained with certainty when measuring (1), even if only one version of the observer sees it. The probability problem is reconciling this with experiments, which indicate results are probabilistic and follow the Born rule.

It has a qualitative aspect, how probabilities emerge from a deterministic theory. In classical mechanics, processes can appear random due to our ignorance of details, but in EQM one must explain randomness even if the quantum state and its evolution are perfectly known. Some authors [Vai98, Sau10, SC16] say there is a *self-locating uncertainty* in the time after the device measures the system, but before the observer sees the result. In their view, in this interval branching has already happened, but each version of the observer is still ignorant about his branch. But this assumes he splits before information about the results reaches him, which is a non-local (and arguably not valid) view of branchings[3], as pointed by Kent [Ken15] and discussed in section 2.2.

There is also the quantitative aspect of accounting for probability values. verett [EI57] proved that if a measure is attributed to branches, and is preserved by further branchings, it equals the Born weights (2). And, as the number of measurements tends to infinity, the total measure of branches with results deviating from the Born rule tends to 0. For finite experiments, this means branches with frequencies deviating beyond a given error have small measure. But this only makes them negligible if Born weights have a probabilistic interpretation, leading to a circular argument. A similar idea was proposed by Graham [Gra73], with the same problem. Gleason's theorem [Gle57] also implies the Born rule, if the probability of a branch does not depend on what other branches the decomposition basis has. Until we know how probabilities can emerge in EQM, we can not be sure they will have the properties required by Everett or Gleason. Of course, if they do not, it would mean EQM is incorrect.

A counting measure, based on the idea that a measurement with n results gives n branches, may seem natural for EQM. It violates Gleason's and Everett's hypotheses, as the probability of a branch would depend on the number of branches in the basis, and it is not conserved if a new measurement is performed only in some branches. After many measurements, any sequence of results will appear in some branch. But the frequency of each result will tend to $1/n$ in most branches, as if all results were equally probable, in disagreement with Born's rule and quantum experiments.

But it might not be possible to count branches. As, in EQM, measurements are no different than other quantum processes, branchings can happen in all interactions, becoming a continuous and pervasive phenomenon. Throwing a die produces not 6, but a large number of branches, resulting from interactions with the air, table, etc. This number might be changing all the time, in unpredictable ways, and be unevenly distributed among the 6 results, as, for example, the number of black dots showing might affect the amount of branchings due to interaction with light. Most interactions involve few particles, so many branches will be macroscopically similar. A coarse-graining, as in section 2.4.3, might reduce and stabilize the number of branches, but it would be somewhat arbitrary, depending on the chosen fineness of grain.

---

[3] This does not apply to a similar idea in the cosmological interpretation of quantum mechanics [AT11].

It makes no sense to literally prove Born's rule in EQM, so by a *Born-like rule* we mean any result explaining why, in an Everettian universe (i.e. one governed by EQM), quantum experiments would appear probabilistic, with probabilities given by the Born weights (2). Other attempts [AL88, Han03, Zur05, BHZ06] have been made to obtain such result, but we focus on Deutsch and Wallace's use of decision theory.

2.3.1 The decision theoretic approach

Decision theory (Appendix A) aims to explain, in situations with probabilistic outcomes (*decision under risk*), how rational (in an axiomatically defined sense) decisions should be made. When probabilities are unknown (*decision under uncertainty*), it shows rational decisions can be described in terms of subjective probabilities.

Deutsch [Deu99] proposed using it to show that, in an Everettian universe, a rational decision maker should decide on bets about results of quantum experiments as if outcomes were probabilistic, with Born weights playing the role of probabilities. He should behave as if such Universe were Copenhagean, with the following strategy:

Born Strategy. *Decisions follow the Principle of Maximization of Expected Utility*[4]*, with Born weights* (2) *in place of probabilities in the expected utilities* (11)*, i.e.*

$$\mathrm{EU} = \sum_i w_i \cdot u(r_i).$$

It may seem reasonable to describe the illusion of chance in EQM in terms of subjective probabilities. But, contrary to a common misconception, this is not what Deutsch's work is about, as we show in section 4. His probabilities are anything but subjective, with their values imposed by the theory.

Critics [BCF$^+$00, Pri06, Mal08] contested his assumptions, proposed reasonable decisions that do not follow the Born Strategy, or called into question the meaning of his result. In response, Wallace [Wal03, Wal07, Wal10, Wal12] has made increasingly sophisticated attempts to clarify and formalize Deutsch's idea. Many authors [SC16, Pol01, Ass11, Wil13, CS13] think this is on the right path, and variations have been proposed, in an attempt to clarify the situation. Critics remain unconvinced [Pri10, Fin09, Ken10, Alb10, Mau14, Jan16], questioning ideas behind Wallace's axioms, or presenting examples of reasonable decisions contrary to his result. But most have focused on his informal presentation, and so far there has been no detailed criticism of his formal axioms and proof [Wal10, Wal12], which stand as the strongest defense of the decision theoretic approach. In section 3 we try to fill this gap.

Proving a Born-like rule via decision theory requires worlds where narratives with agents and bets make sense. This involves solving first the problem we describe next.

2.4 The preferred basis problem

It consists in finding a natural way to decompose a macroscopic quantum state into branches behaving like the classical reality we observe (even if not all of them, and not all the time). We focus on Wallace's approach [Wal12], based on decoherent histories.

---

[4] See Appendix A.

2.4.1 Decoherence

Decoherence [Zur02, Sch07, JZK$^+$03] is a process by which an open quantum system loses some quantum characteristics, as it interacts and gets entangled with its environment. Many models show some states, called *pointer states*, are more robust with respect to such interaction, having a stronger tendency to remain disentangled. For example, in the quantum brownian motion, considered a good paradigm for a macroscopic system scattering particles from the environment, they are minimum-uncertainty Gaussian packets (coherent states) $|x, p\rangle$, forming an overcomplete set of vectors.

As the environment is differently affected by distinct pointer states, and such differences spread across its many degrees of freedom, it rapidly evolves into (almost) orthogonal states. Off-diagonal elements (*coherences*) of the reduced density matrix of the system, with respect to the pointer states, decay extremely fast. This (almost) eliminates interference between such states, and we say the system has *decohered*. Close pointer states take longer to decohere, but this problem can be reduced by coarse graining, as we discuss in section 2.4.3. As the reduced density matrix becomes diagonal, it formally resembles a classical probabilistic mixture, and this is seen as an important step in obtaining classical behavior out of quantum systems.

The reduced density matrix of an open system follows a master equation, and its dynamics lacks unitarity, which is central to Wallace's arguments. So in describing the evolution of branches he turns to the consistent/decoherent histories formalisms, which apply to closed quantum systems (ultimately, to the whole Universe).

2.4.2 Consistent Histories (CH)

The *consistent histories* formalism [Gri84, Gri02, Omn88, Omn99] identifies conditions allowing us to assign classical probabilities to sets of alternative histories, conceived as sequences of events or propositions about a quantum system.

Its point of view is opposite to the Everettian one: quantum evolution is always stochastic, and quantum states are only tools for calculating probabilities in a set of possible evolutions, only one of which actually happens. Still, parts of the formalism adapt well to the Everettian setting, if appropriately reinterpreted. We present a simplified version[5], assuming a normalized pure initial state ψ_0 at time t_0.

A *quantum sample space* is an orthogonal projective decomposition of Hilbert space, a family $\{P_\alpha\}$ of orthogonal projection operators with $\sum_\alpha P_\alpha = \mathbb{1}$ and $P_\alpha P_\beta = \delta_{\alpha\beta} P_\alpha$. It represents an exhaustive set of mutually exclusive events or propositions about the system. The Heisenberg picture is used, with $P_\alpha(t) = U(t, t_0)^{-1} P_\alpha U(t, t_0)$, where $U(t, t_0)$ is the unitary time evolution operator given by Schrodinger's equation.

A *history space* is a sequence $\{P_{\alpha_1}(t_1)\}, \ldots, \{P_{\alpha_n}(t_n)\}$ of quantum sample spaces, at times $t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_n$. A *history* $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ is a sequence of events, specifying one $P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)$ from each sample space. In each history space, satisfying a condition described below, only one history happens, with probability postulated by

$$p_\alpha = ||\psi_\alpha||^2 , \tag{5}$$

where the *branch state vector* $\psi_\alpha = P_{\alpha_n}(t_n) \cdots P_{\alpha_1}(t_1)\psi_0$ is considered as just a mathematical tool to calculate probabilities.

A history space $\{\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}_k}(t_k)\}$ is a *coarse-graining* or *coarsening* of $\{P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)\}$ if each $\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}_k}(t_k)$ is a sum of $P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)$'s. Conversely, $\{P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)\}$ is a *fine-graining* or *refinement* of $\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}_k}(t_k)$. This fits in the formalism by bundling history spaces into a *history algebra*, specified by taking, at each t_k, a *quantum event algebra*, which is a Boolean algebra[6] of orthogonal projectors. The Boolean condition implies projectors commute, so when their ranges have intersection $\{0\}$ they are mutually orthogonal.

---

[5] Reflecting its stochastic point of view, CH is usually presented using density operators.

To get a history algebra, we can start with a history space and take all coarsenings. The original projectors are minimal elements (*atoms*) generating the event algebras. Not all history algebras are formed this way, and some have no atoms. An algebra is *atomic* if it is generated by atoms. Wallace uses the term in such sense, but defines [Wal12, p.95] it in terms of countable generators. It is incorrect, as any countable algebra is generated by all its elements, even if it has no minimal ones.

Given a coarsening $\{\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}_k}(t_k)\}$ of $\{P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)\}$, each coarser history $\bar{\alpha}$ can be seen as a family of finer ones. We write $\alpha \in \bar{\alpha}$ if, for each k, the range of $\bar{P}_{\bar{\alpha}_k}(t_k)$ contains that of $P_{\alpha_k}(t_k)$. CH requires the p_α's to behave as classical probabilities, so they must be additive, $p_{\bar{\alpha}} = \sum_{\alpha \in \bar{\alpha}} p_\alpha$. Hence there must be no interference between histories, and $\langle \psi_\alpha | \psi_\beta \rangle = 0$ if $\alpha \neq \beta$. History spaces satisfying this are called *consistent*[7] (relative to ψ_0), and are the only ones allowed in CH. Two consistent history spaces can be *incompatible*, in the sense that they can not be combined into a single consistent one. Either one can be used to describe a quantum process, but not both at once.

A history space has a *branching structure* (relative to ψ_0) if histories do not merge after diverging, i.e. if α and β satisfy $\alpha_i \neq \beta_i$ and $\alpha_j = \beta_j$, for some $i < j$, one of them has zero probability. Consistency and branching are related as follows [Gri93, Wal12].

Branching-Consistency Theorem. [8] *Any history space with a branching structure is consistent, and the converse holds for some consistent refinement of it.*

The idea [Wal12, p.429] for the converse is that, since the ψ_α's are orthogonal by consistency, a branching refinement can be constructed from projectors $\frac{1}{p_\alpha}|\psi_\alpha\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha|$. Wallace claims [Wal12, p.96] this result extends to history algebras, but it seems wrong, as these projectors might not be in the original algebra.

2.4.3 Decoherent Histories (DH)

CH admits histories that are far from classical. The *decoherent histories* formalism [GMH90, GMH93] combines CH and decoherence to get special history spaces with a more classical behavior. Besides (approximate) consistency[9], it also seeks *quasi-classicality*, meaning histories approximately follow classical equations of motion, interrupted at times (as in quantum measurements) by some quantum behavior.

In DH, the space of relevant variables of the system of interest is partitioned in cells Σ_α, large in comparison with the coherence lenght (below which decoherence is not effective), yet small enough for the required precision. This determines a quantum sample space given by operators $P_\alpha \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\text{env}}$, where

$$P_\alpha = \int_{\Sigma_\alpha} \mathrm{d}x |x\rangle\langle x|, \tag{6}$$

and $\mathbb{1}_{\text{env}}$ is the identity operator for the environment (taken to include the irrelevant variables of the system). A history α specifies, at a sequence of times t_k, in which Σ_{α_k} the system is[10].

---

[6] With operations $P_1 \wedge P_2 = P_1 P_2$, $P_1 \vee P_2 = P_1 + P_2 - P_1 P_2$, and $\neg P = \mathbb{1} - P$.

[7] The terminology varies. Wallace uses consistency for additivity of probabilities, and decoherence for non-interference. The concept of decoherence from section 2.4.1 is related but not equivalent to this one.

[8] Branching-Decoherence Theorem, in Wallace's terminology.

[9] In Gell-Mann and Hartle's terminology, medium decoherence.

[10] If necessary, different families of cells can be used at each time.

Coarsenings and refinements are obtained varying the cell size.

For large enough cells, states in the range of different P_α's are distinct enough to quickly get entangled to (almost) orthogonal states of the environment. Orthogonality tends to subsist, as the environment evolves, for its many degrees of freedom *keep records* of the history. For example, particles scattered by the system in different directions, at distinct Σ_α's, tend to remain in (almost) orthogonal states, and affect other degrees of freedom in distinct ways. Erasing from the environment all traces of the history is impossible in practice. Of course, as different states of the environment evolve, they can spontaneously develop similar components, blurring their records, but their Born weights would be negligibly small.

As records ensure (almost) consistency, (almost) additive probabilities can be assigned to histories, as in CH. Some interference can remain, but it is negligible if histories are coarse enough. Deviations in the additivity of probabilities should be irrelevant, as long as they are too small to be detected experimentally.

The Branching-Consistency Theorem gives an (approximate) branching structure for a refinement. But it will not be in terms of projectors $P_{\tilde{\alpha}} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\text{env}}$ into smaller cells $\Sigma_{\tilde{\alpha}}$, as it will require projecting environmental states onto the different records.

Models show that, if histories are coarse enough, and the system has enough inertia to resist noise from the environment, histories with non-negligible probabilities will (approximately) follow classical equations of motion, with a stochastic force.

So a (almost) consistent history space seems to emerge naturally in DH, and its non-negligible histories are quasi-classical. However, we can still have incompatible descriptions of the evolution, as shown by Dowker and Kent [DK96].

2.4.4 Non-Probabilistic Decoherent Histories (NPDH)

Wallace uses DH to solve the preferred basis problem. But EQM is not stochastic, and all histories happen, so probabilities (5) should not be postulated, but obtained solving the probability problem. As his proof of the Born rule depends on branches provided by the first solution, it forms a circular argument [Bak07].

By *Non-Probabilistic Decoherent Histories* we mean the non-probabilistic parts of DH, reinterpreted from an Everettian perspective. Approximations justified in DH on the basis of negligible probabilities must be reexamined. Wallace has given [Wal12, p.253] non-probabilistic reasons for them, but, as we show in [Man17], they do not seem valid, and NPDH has strange features:

1. Absent a reason to disregard them, small amplitude branches are as relevant as large ones. This causes *branch discontinuities*: arbitrarily small changes in a quantum state can create lots of non negligible branches. Approximations used in decoherence can no longer be justified.
2. All macroscopic histories happen and are equally relevant, no matter how erratic. Branches exhibit macroscopic quantum jumps all the time, with no macroscopic sense of causality. Those allowing a meaningful macroscopic narrative are the exception, and even they keep sprouting weird subbranches. Records are unreliable, and tiny branches can suffer interference from much larger ones. An alternative view is that there is no real history, as all macroscopic states are always present.
3. Even quasi-classical branches might not resemble our world, unless they have large Born weights. Without a Born-like rule, preferring these would be cherry picking those similar enough to our world to give results we want. So no premise can be accepted, and no possibility excluded, based on our physical experience.

4. Orthogonality might not mean in EQM the same as in CQM. Measurements (or branch decompositions) in almost orthogonal bases may be possible, and orthogonal states might not be mutually exclusive upon measurement. An almost orthogonal set of branches can be linearly dependent, so, even allowing for coarsenings or refinements, branch decompositions might not be unique. Two decompositions of the same state can involve quite different sets of branches.
5. Decoherence does not really happen in terms of cells with precise boundaries, as pointer states $|\pi_x\rangle$ tend to be like gaussian packets, peaked at a point x, but with small tails across all space. In DH it does not make much difference, as the tails give negligible probabilities. In NPDH it may be better to replace (6) by the following projectors, which can give more stable branches, but are only almost orthogonal to each other:

$$P_\alpha = \int_{\Sigma_\alpha} \mathrm{d}x |\pi_x\rangle\langle\pi_x|. \tag{7}$$

Once we have a Born-like rule, these problems should not matter, affecting only very unlikely branches. But in proving such rule they must be taken into account.

2.4.5 Causal Histories

A better solution to the preferred basis problem could be through the causal histories formalism proposed in [Man17]. It gives Born weights a non-probabilistic role, as measures of resistance to interference, and causality. A history of tiny amplitude can be disregarded not for being unlikely, but for suffering so much interference that it becomes impossible to track causal relations between its events.

Such formalism is in development, and many questions need answer to ensure it would work as expected. If it does, it would show Born weights have a role to play in EQM prior to any Born-like rule. And it should give well behaved branches, similar to our classical reality, providing an appropriate framework for Walace's proof.

2.5 Rationality

If there is intelligent life in a branch, would it reason in ways we can comprehend? Would some kind of rationality even be possible? Wallace's answer is yes. He claims [Wal10, p.237] that, in an Everettian Universe, there is at least one rational way to decide, the Born Strategy, and the aim of his proof is to show there is no other. But this argument is circular: that strategy is called rational because it satisfies his axioms, while some of them are justified assuming rationality is possible.

In decision theory, rationality means compliance with certain axioms. These are chosen as rules intelligent people would agree should be followed, to have the best chance of achieving an objective (although, in practice, it is common to unwittingly disobey them). Philosophically, one might want to include the choice of objective in the analysis of rationality, but, for our purposes, a purely operational approach suffices. That the rules were chosen correctly is confirmed by the course of action they engender. For decision under risk, it can be shown, via law of large numbers, to be the one most likely to give best results in the long run. For decision under uncertainty, it depends on how good the agent's estimations of probabilities are.

To build an Everettian decision theory, Wallace chooses axioms he thinks an intelligent Everettian agent would follow. But, given the unknowns about an Everettian universe, even the best educated guess might be off. To test the axioms, one might check if an agent who abides by them tends to be better off, in the long term, than one who does not. But it depends on how we measure success, as there will be several versions of the agent, each with a different set of results. Some counterexamples to Wallace's result, like the distributive-justice or variety rules [Wal12, sec. 5.8], arise from lack of a consensual criterion for evaluating success in a branching Universe.

In NPDH, it may not even make sense to talk about consequences of a decision. If all histories happen, all decisions lead to the same results: all possible ones. Even if a decision increases the Born weight of a result, without a Born-like rule this may be irrelevant. In an universe lacking macroscopic causality, there is probably no meaningful way to say a decision is rational. Or, what amounts to the same, we could say all decisions are rational. In any case, using such label to mean adherence to a set of axioms, which can not be justified a priori nor a posteriori, is pointless.

2.6 Relevance of Branchings

Some of Wallace's axioms assume the agent does not care about branchings per se. The relative relevance of sets of branches, however he measures it, does not change just because a quantum experiment is performed in one set. This holds if he measures it via Born weights, as branchings preserve them, but not with branch counting.

As seen in section 2.3, to our knowledge there is no good way to count branches, as it depends on the decomposition basis, and varies wildly as branchings occur all the time. A coarse graining might give us a number, but it would be somewhat arbitrary, depending on the fineness of grain. And in NPDH it might be infinite.

But failure of this crude idea of branch counting does not exhaust all possibilities. There might be a more sophisticated way to estimate the amount of branches, or another measure of relevance not preserved by branchings. We throw some ideas, just to show nothing in EQM seems to forbid it:

- there may be an optimal interval of fineness, coarse enough to reduce interference and stabilize the number of branches, yet fine enough not to mix macroscopically distinct states. The average number in this interval might be a good measure;
- a weighted average, giving smaller weights to the less stable branch numbers obtained on finer grainings, might result in a good number;
- branches with tiny Born weights suffer much interference, so we might count only the more stable causal histories [Man17];
- even if we can not attribute a stable number to each set of branches, obtaining a stable ratio between them would suffice to measure their relative relevance;
- if the wavefunction can be truncated below some cutoff, a measure could be given by the volumes of regions in which it is above the cutoff. If cells are small, this gives a stable way to compare ratios of their numbers.
- the agent might have some qualitative way to compare branching structures and say one is richer than other, or that quantum measurements make it more ramified.

Even if these ideas fail as well, the point is we can not say a branching sensitive measure is impossible just because we do not know any. Not proving the relevance of branchings is not the same as proving their irrelevance.

3 Wallace's formal proof of the Born rule

Wallace's latest attempt [Wal10, Wal12] to formalize Deutsch's ideas begins with an informal presentation of the ideas, and justification for the axioms. It is followed by formal definitions and proof, but at times they bear little resemblance to his explanations, not translating correctly the ideas discussed. Also, expressing quantum ideas in a language closer to Decision Theory has taken its toll, making the notation clumsier, and letting concepts seem less troublesome than they are.

We provide a new presentation of the proof, criticism of its problems, and suggestions to improve it. Although we follow the same general lines, changes were made, which, in our opinion, clarify it without affecting the result. We stick to the usual quantum notation, to remove a layer of complexity, and to avoid accepting a result just because it sounds reasonable in a decision theoretic terminology.

3.1 Basic concepts

A *quantum decision problem* is specified by:

- A separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.
- A collection $\mathcal{E}$ of closed[11] subspaces of $\mathcal{H}$, with $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{E}$, forming a complete Boolean algebra under countable operations of $\wedge$, $\vee$, and $\perp$.[12]
- A finite[13] partition $\mathcal{R}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ (a *partition* of $E \in \mathcal{E}$ is a set of mutually orthogonal elements of $\mathcal{E}$ whose disjunction is E).
- A subset $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{E}$ such that any $E \in \mathcal{E}$ has a partition in elements of $\mathcal{M}$.
- For each $E \in \mathcal{E}$, a set $\mathcal{U}_E$ of unitary operators from E into $\mathcal{H}$.[14]

A solution is given, for each state ψ of each $M \in \mathcal{M}$, by a *preference order* $\succ_\psi$ on $\mathcal{U}_M$, satisfying axioms given in section 3.2. From $\succ_\psi$, the symbols $\prec_\psi$, $\sim_\psi$, $\succcurlyeq_\psi$, and $\preccurlyeq_\psi$ are defined as usual.

Notation. To keep notations simple and consistent, we adopt the convention that:

- ψ, ϕ, φ are always used for states;
- M, N for elements of $\mathcal{M}$;
- r, s, t for elements of $\mathcal{R}$;
- E, F for elements of $\mathcal{E}$;
- U, V, W, X for elements of some $\mathcal{U}_E$.
- $\mathcal{O}_U$ represents the intersection of all $E \in \mathcal{E}$ containing the range of U.
- Π_E is the orthogonal projector onto E.
- indices i, j run over countable index sets.

Justifications for the axioms depend on how $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{M}$ or $\mathcal{U}_E$ are interpreted. Wallace hints at how he conceives of them, but important details are left out, allowing for conflicting interpretations. He describes [Wal12, p.163] a quantum decision problem as one in which, in an Everettian Universe, a system prepared in some initial state is to be measured in some basis. Bets are available, giving, in each branch, a certain payoff, depending on the result in that branch. And an Everettian agent (someone who knows EQM correctly describes his Universe, and knows the Born weights of that state in the measurement basis) has to decide which bets he prefers.

---

[11] Wallace omits this condition, which is necessary to avoid some difficulties, like $(E^\perp)^\perp \neq E$.

[12] See section 3.1.1 for definitions.

[13] This condition is added for simplicity. See section 3.1.3 for a discussion.

[14] Wallace's definition includes some conditions, which we placed with the Richness Axioms.

In this setting, $\mathcal{H}$ must be the Hilbert space of the total system of interest (agent, measuring device, payoffs, etc.), plus its environment. Ultimately, it must be the Hilbert space of the whole Universe, as for open quantum systems evolution is non-unitary, which would invalidate Wallace's proof.

3.1.1 Events

An element of $\mathcal{E}$ is called an *event*, and intuitively it is the subspace spanned by all states satisfying some proposition. For example, we could have an event E spanned by all states in which a spin measurement resulted up and the agent received \$10.

Operators $\wedge$, $\vee$, $\perp$ play in Quantum Logic [BVN36, EGL09] roles similar to the connectives AND, OR, NOT of Classical Logic. A *conjunction* $\wedge_i E_i$ is the intersection of subspaces E_i, a *disjunction* $\vee_i E_i$ is the closure of the span of their union, and $E^\perp$ is the orthogonal complement of E. We also write $E \perp F$ meaning E and F are orthogonal, and $\dot{\vee}$ for disjunctions of orthogonal subspaces. An important difference between quantum and classical (Boolean) logics is that the distributive law fails. For example, if S_u, S_d and S_h are eigenspaces of spin up, down, and in some horizontal direction, then $S_h \wedge (S_u \vee S_d) = S_h$ but $(S_h \wedge S_u) \vee (S_h \wedge S_d) = \{0\}$.

By requiring $\mathcal{E}$ to be a Boolean algebra[15], Wallace is forcing a classical structure on it, in the same spirit of CH. In fact, it is equivalent to the quantum event algebras. He uses the same algebra at all times, as for him events represent *macroproperties*, which emerge naturally in EQM via decoherence, as in DH. Distributivity implies $E = (E \wedge F) \vee (E \wedge F^\perp)$, so the Boolean condition requires the following one.

Orthogonality Condition. *Conjunction of two events is zero if, and only if, they are orthogonal, i.e.*

$$E \wedge F = \{0\} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad E \perp F.$$

This makes conjunctions correspond to orthogonal projections, $E \wedge F = \Pi_F E$.

Events E and F are *disjoint* or *mutually exclusive* if, whenever a state of E is tested for the condition of F, the result is false, and vice versa. Classically, it means no state has both conditions, and is equivalent to $E \cap F = \emptyset$. In CQM this is replaced by $E \perp F$, since measuring the property of F in a state nonorthogonal to it can result true. In EQM, it will definitely result true in some branch. The Orthogonality Condition makes quantum disjointness similar to the classical one.

To partition an event is to decompose it in mutually exclusive subevents. Given partitions $\{E_i\}$ and $\{F_j\}$ of the same event, $\{F_j\}$ is a *refinement* of $\{E_i\}$, and $\{E_i\}$ is a *coarsening* of $\{F_j\}$, if each E_i admits a partition in terms of F_j's. With the Orthogonality Condition, two partitions of an event always have a common refinement.

As stated in section 2.4.4, orthogonality might not play in EQM its usual role. If almost orthogonal measurements turn out to be possible, $E \perp F$ would no longer ensure mutual exclusivity, and, in fact, there would be no mutually exclusive events. Likewise, use of $\perp$ as a negation operator might not be valid.

The requirement that $\mathcal{E}$ be complete is a technical condition, that every subset of the algebra has a supremum, necessary for operating with infinitely many elements. It is not really restrictive, as any Boolean algebra admits a unique completion.

---

[15] In [Wal12], Wallace gives, on pp. 152 and 435, good definitions of the Boolean condition. But on pp. 95 and 175 there are imprecise characterizations, which make it seem less restrictive than it is.

3.1.2 Macrostates

Elements of $\mathcal{M}$ are called *macrostates*. Given a partition of $\mathcal{H}$ into macrostates M_i, ψ has a *branch decomposition* with *branches* $\psi_i \in M_i$ if $\psi = \sum_i \psi_i$. The Orthogonality Condition implies two branch decompositions of ψ admit a common refinement. As any E has a partition in macrostates, events are disjunctions of macrostates satisfying some condition, and $\psi \in E$ if it is decomposable in branches having such condition.

So far, the definition of $\mathcal{M}$ is too flexible. It can be any subset of $\mathcal{E}$ which generates it via orthogonal disjunctions, even $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{E}$. Or it can be any set of orthogonal subspaces whose disjunction is $\mathcal{H}$, with $\mathcal{E}$ being the Boolean algebra it generates. Wallace mentions these cases [Wal12, p.176], but his axioms can not be justified in such artificial examples, and a more concrete characterization of $\mathcal{M}$ is needed.

He states [Wal12, p.164] that "the choice of macrostates is largely fixed by decoherence, although the precise fineness of grain of the decomposition is underspecified". They should not be too coarse, so that "an agent can be assumed not to care exactly what the microstate is within a given macrostate". Also, "an agent can have no practical control as to what state she gets, within a particular macrostate, on familiar statistical-mechanics and decoherence grounds" [Wal12, p.170].

It seems he has in mind the ranges of operators $P_\alpha \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\text{env}}$, used in DH. Different families of cells Σ_α can be used, to allow for refinements or coarsenings. Cells should be large enough for decoherence, yet small enough that the agent is indifferent to points in the same cell. So states in the same $M \in \mathcal{M}$ should differ, for the system of interest, only on microscopic details. There can be macroscopic differences in the environment, but we must assume they are beyond the agent's control and he does not care about them. So each macrostate determines the state of the system of interest at the macroscopic level, playing the role of a classical state.

For the Irreversibility axiom, it would be necessary to further refine macrostates by partitioning the Hilbert space of the environment according to all possible history records. So each macrostate should specify not only the macroscopic state of the system of interest, but also the specific record of the history that led to such state.

If the P_α's are as in (6), the Orthogonality Condition holds, but, as stated in section 2.4.4, macrostates might be highly unstable. This makes them bad models for classical states, and Wallace's axioms hardly justifiable. With (7), we get more stability, but at the cost of that condition, and the Boolean one, being satisfied only approximately, with all consequences entailed by almost orthogonality.

Wallace describes [Wal12, p.165] an $\mathcal{E}$ formed by functions supported in open sets of $\mathbb{R}^N$. He says it can not be generated by macrostates, relating it to atomless history spaces [Wal12, p.95], to show why he would not ask that all $\mathcal{E}$ be constructible from $\mathcal{M}$. This is confusing, as his definitions do require it. In any case, the example is wrong: as the topology of $\mathbb{R}^N$ is second countable, $\mathcal{E}$ is generated by a countable subset of events, which can be taken as $\mathcal{M}$. The problem here seems to be the confusion, seen in section 2.4.2, between atoms and generators.

3.1.3 Rewards

Elements of $\mathcal{R}$ are events called *rewards*. Wallace says they "represent payoffs an agent could get" [Wal12, p.175], and are "... a coarse-graining of the macrostate subspaces ... such that an agent's only preference is to which reward subspace she is in" [Wal12, p. 165]. So there seems to be two distinct characterizations of $\mathcal{R}$:

Rewards as Payoffs. *To each payoff of a bet there corresponds some* $r \in \mathcal{R}$, *consisting of the disjunction of all macrostates in which the agent received that payoff.*

Rewards as Preferences. *Rewards should be set up in such a way that the agent will be indifferent between two states of the same r.*

Wallace alternates between these, but they may be incompatible. Suppose some bets give a \$10 prize, and consider, for example, that receiving it in one that takes a lot of time and effort may be less preferable than in a coin flip. By Rewards as Payoffs we should have a single reward subspace corresponding to this prize, which we label as $r =$"\$10". Rewards as Preferences would require several: $r_1 =$"\$10 on a quick bet", $r_2 =$"\$10 on a bet requiring extra experiments", etc.

The source of confusion might be in the use of the term "payoff". Wallace says [Wal12, p.167] that in his decision problems "measurements are being made and payments are being provided", with "envelopes of cash". As this is meant to justify his Reward Availability axiom, it seems reward subspaces correspond to such payments. In other occasions he also uses payoffs as meaning cash or other tangible prizes. This leads to Rewards as Payoffs, with rewards and payoffs equated with such prizes.

But in classical decision theory (Appendix A) payoffs or rewards refer not only to prizes awarded, but can cover other relevant factors, such as the price paid to take part in the lottery, the effort or time spent in the betting process, and so on. A big achievement of the theory was replacing the monetary value of the prize by a more flexible utility value, which can take these factors into account. If we took payoffs to have such broader meaning, covering all factors the agent might care about, the two characterizations would coincide. Classically this is not so hard, if we have a good intuition about the problem. But in the Everettian case it is not easy to decide what can be relevant, as shown in section 2.6 for branchings.

As we can not be sure to know all an Everettian agent might care about, it is better to keep using payoffs to mean cash prizes. Including other factors, and assuming the agent takes only them into account, risks neglecting things like branchings or erasures (see section 3.2.1) before we know it is reasonable to do so. It is safer to admit the characterizations of $\mathcal{R}$ are inequivalent, and keep that which better suits our purposes. Rewards as Payoffs is easier to implement. Not knowing a priori what the agent cares about, we would not be able, under Rewards as Preferences, to set $\mathcal{R}$ as an input for the problem. We might try to define it a posteriori, in terms of $\succ$. This may have been Wallace's initial idea, as he says that reward subspace is a derived concept ([Wal10, p.234], removed in [Wal12]). But this would lead to difficulties with axioms refering to $\mathcal{R}$, as statements about it could depend on properties of $\succ$ we are yet to deduce.

If, under Rewards as Preferences, we take rewards to be sets of equally preferred states, it is not clear why they should be subspaces, closed, or mutually orthogonal. The variety rule, proposed by Adam Elga ([Wal12, p.193], also discussed in [Mau14]), is an example that a superposition of states might be preferable to each.

Wallace's description of $\mathcal{R}$ as a coarse-graining of $\mathcal{M}$ suggests that any M will be in some r. But his example of $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{E}$, and the use of $N \wedge r$ in the statement of Macrostate Indifference, indicate otherwise. If the Orthogonality Condition is valid then $M = \dot{\bigvee}_{r\in\mathcal{R}} M \wedge r$, so an M not contained in any r intercepts, non-trivially, at least two rewards r_1 and r_2. In case of Rewards as Payoffs, having different payoffs in M goes against the idea that its states are similar. With Rewards as Preferences, it contradicts the idea that the agent should not have preferences between states of M.

Our condition that $\mathcal{R}$ be finite is just to avoid some technicalities and focus on the main parts of Wallace's proof. It does not seem like an important loss of generality, and if necessary the proof can be adapted to work with infinitely many rewards.

3.1.4 Acts

Elements of $\mathcal{U}_E$ are *acts available at* E. Intuitivelly, an act might be, for example, preparation of a quantum state, its measurement, placing a bet, receiving a payoff, or any other actions of interest. Availability of an act depends on E, e.g. the act of deciding a bet will be available only at events in which that bet has been placed.

In EQM, even macroscopic evolutions are described by unitary operators. But this assumes closed systems, so each act U describes not only actions related to the decision problem, but also everything else happening in the environment (ultimately, the whole Universe). This can include extraneous facts, like the agent's favorite team winning or losing a game, which could alter his preference for one U over another. Perhaps one could select for comparison only acts which do not differ significantly on their effects on the environment, but it is not clear how to do so in practice.

The range $U(E)$ might not be in $\mathcal{E}$, so we use $\mathcal{O}_U$, the smallest event containing it. For $\psi \in E$, a partition $\mathcal{O}_U = \dot{\bigvee}_i M_i$ gives a branch decomposition of $U\psi$ in the M_i's. If the Orthogonality Condition is valid, these are the only branches resulting from the act, up to coarsenings or refinements.

At a branched state there are many versions of the agent, each acting on his own branch M_i. In EQM their individual acts $U_i \in \mathcal{U}_{M_i}$ are restrictions of some $U \in \mathcal{U}_{\dot{\bigvee}_i M_i}$. In Wallace's terminology, they form a *compatible act function*. Being the M_i's mutually orthogonal, so must be their images $U(M_i)$. So acts in different branches are linked, threatening the independence of the agent's versions. But as evolution of the M_i's tends to preserve macroscopic differences, and the environment keeps (approximate) records of the macroscopic history, the images of the U_i's tend to be almost orthogonal. Small adjustments might be enough to get perfect orthogonality. However, in NPDH such adjustments could cause the creation or elimination of lots of branches which, despite their tiny Born weights, can not be considered irrelevant.

Wallace says *contemplatable* might be a better term than *available*. This distinction is important, allowing us to exclude irrelevant acts, and include some which are not feasible, but the agent might want to consider as if they were possible. Inclusion of physically impossible acts is actually unavoidable. As EQM is deterministic, there is always only one possible act. Even the agent's choices are predetermined, as the act of choosing might at best correspond to branching into all possible decisions. Of course, determinism in Classical Mechanics never kept anyone from worrying about decisions, which can be considered abstractly, as if the agent could choose what to do. Classically, that is easy, as the agent can be treated as separated from the process. In EQM this might not be so simple, for if we want to consider how branchings affect him, he must be included in the deterministic dynamics of the system.

We note that the only acts used in Wallace's proof are combinations of identity acts, reward acts, branching acts, and erasures (see section 3.2.1 for definitions).

3.2 Axioms and further definitions

Wallace's axioms are organized in two sets: richness axioms, which are conditions on the sets $\mathcal{U}_E$ giving the agent a good selection of acts to use, and rationality axioms, which are conditions his preference orders $\succ_\psi$ must satisfy to be considered rational.

3.2.1 Richness axioms

Indolence. $\mathbb{1}_E \in \mathcal{U}_E$ *for any* $E \in \mathcal{E}$.

Restriction. *Let* $E, F \in \mathcal{E}$ *with* $F \subset E$. *If* $U \in \mathcal{U}_E$ *then* $U|_F \in \mathcal{U}_F$.

Composition. *Let* $E \in \mathcal{E}$. *If* $U \in \mathcal{U}_E$ *and* $V \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_U}$ *then* $VU \in \mathcal{U}_E$.

These are straightforward. Wallace's Continuation and Indolence axioms were replaced by a simpler one, as events with $\mathcal{U}_E = \emptyset$ play no role in the decision problem.

Irreversibility. *Let* $E, F \in \mathcal{E}$*. If* $E \perp F$ *then* $\mathcal{O}_{U|_E} \perp \mathcal{O}_{U|_F}$*, for any* $U \in \mathcal{U}_{E \dot\vee F}$*.*

Wallace uses $\mathcal{O}_{U|_E} \wedge \mathcal{O}_{U|_F} = \{0\}$ instead of $\mathcal{O}_{U|_E} \perp \mathcal{O}_{U|_F}$, that is needed for the Equivalence Lemma. If the Orthogonality Condition is valid these are equivalent. He also omits the necessary hypothesis $E \perp F$, without which we could even have $E = F$.

By unitarity $U(E) \perp U(F)$, so the axiom means orthogonality is not lost when extending to the smallest events containing these ranges. This depends on how $\mathcal{E}$ is set. With the Orthogonality Condition, $\mathcal{O}_{U|_E} \perp \mathcal{O}_{U|_F}$ means states of $U(E)$ and $U(F)$ have no common branches, i.e. components in the same macrostate. The idea is of a branching structure: evolution of distinct branches can not generate a common one.

At first, Wallace's only argument in this direction is that an agent in a specific branch can not cause branches to merge [Wal12, p.164]. But, even if this can not be done on purpose, it is conceivable that tiny violations of irreversibility might happen naturally. In fact, under NPDH, they seem to happen all the time. We may even have large violations, for macrostates corresponding to adjacent cells.

Later he discusses irreversibility at lenght [Wal12, ch.9], tracing parallels with the Second Law of Thermodinamics. But at that point he assumes the Born rule as proven [Wal12, p.333], so his conclusions can not justify this axiom. Note that most physical laws are reversible, the Measurement Postulate and the Second Law being notable exceptions. Both are poorly understood, and might be linked somehow. In throwing away the first, we may have invalidated the second in EQM. In any case, the Second Law would not prevent branches from merging, it would only enact a cost for this, in terms of an increase in the entropy of the environmental variables.

He also appeals to the Branching-Consistency Theorem [Wal12, p.334]. But it does not apply to history algebras, so the branching structure might not be in terms of macrostates, unless these are defined separating history records in the environment. And decoherence gives almost consistency, so the branching would be approximate.

This axiom is only used in the Equivalence Lemma, where small violations of irreversibility would result in $U_1' U_1 \psi_1 = U_2' U_2 \psi_2$ being satisfied only approximately. If violations are small enough, it might still be possible to use State Supervenience in that lemma, combined with Problem Continuity and Solution Continuity.

Problem Continuity. *Let* $E \in \mathcal{E}$*. Then* $\mathcal{U}_E$ *is an open subset of the set of unitary operators from* E *into* $\mathcal{H}$*, in the operator norm topology.*

So, if U is available, all acts sufficiently close to it are also available. Wallace's justification is physical imprecision, as the agent can not control every microscopic detail of his actions. But even small perturbations of U can lead to the appearance of many new branches, which, as seen in section 2.4.4, can not be neglected despite their tiny amplitudes. This axiom is only used in the Utility Lemma, with Standard Acts, and can be discarded if these can be constructed in a continuous way.

We replaced Wallace's Reward Availability, Branching Availability, and Erasure axioms by versions restricted to macrostates, and added another, Compatibility, to extend them to branched states. The reason is that he justifies them only for single branches, and the passage to multiple ones, which was left implicit, is not trivial.

Reward Availability. *For any* $M \in \mathcal{M}$ *and* $r \in \mathcal{R}$*, there is* $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$ *such that* $\mathcal{O}_U \subset r$*.*

Wallace's justification for the availability of such *reward acts* is that "envelopes of cash can always be given to people" [Wal12, p.167], implying Rewards as Payoffs. Under Rewards as Preferences it might not be so easy to produce such acts.

Branching Availability. *Let* $r \in \mathcal{R}$*,* $M \in \mathcal{M}$ *with* $M \subset r$*, and* $\psi \in M$*. Given positive numbers* $\{p_i\}$ *with* $\sum_i p_i = 1$*, there are* $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$*, with* $\mathcal{O}_U \subset r$*, and a partition* $\mathcal{O}_U = \dot{\vee}_i M_i$*, with* $M_i \in \mathcal{M}$*, such that* $|\Pi_{M_i} U\psi|^2 = p_i \cdot |\psi|^2$*.*

This is explained by the possibility of preparing and measuring a quantum state to cause such *branching act.* If Rewards as Payoffs is valid, this leads to a state in the same r, as no payoff is affected. With Rewards as Preferences it is not clear why we can expect $\mathcal{O}_U \subset r$, unless we are sure the agent does not care about branchings.

Erasure. *Let* $r \in \mathcal{R}$ *and* $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ *with* $M, N \subset r$*. If* $\psi \in M$ *and* $\varphi \in N$*, with* $|\psi| = |\varphi|$*, there are* $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$ *and* $V \in \mathcal{U}_N$ *such that* $\mathcal{O}_U, \mathcal{O}_V \subset r$ *and* $U\psi = V\varphi$*.*

The idea of such *erasure* acts is that, once the agent receives the payoff, he can erase all information of how he got it (e.g., through which result, of which bet). But, as he is part of the quantum system, it would entail wiping out his memory of the bet. The same holds for the environment, which was supposed to keep unerasable records.

As erasures do not alter payoffs, the final state remains in r, if Rewards as Payoffs is valid. It is not clear why that would happen with Rewards as Preferences.

Wallace describes U and V as taking ψ and φ into an *erasure subspace* e_r, "whose states correspond to the agent throwing the preparation system away after receiving the payoff but without recording the actual result of the measuremen" [Wal12, p.167]. To explain why $U\psi$ and $V\varphi$ are equal, he says that, as the agent

> . . . lacks the fine control to know which act he is performing, all erasures should be counted as available if any are. It follows that, since for any two such agents all erasures are available, in particular there will be two erasures available satisfying the axiom. [Wal12, p.167]

He seems to mean that, if an erasure takes ψ to some $\phi \in e_r$, there will be others taking it to any other $\tilde{\phi} \in e_r$, as the agent has no precise control of the final microstate. If that was the case then we could get $U\psi = V\varphi$. But the argument fails if e_r is not a single macrostate. Even if it is, not being able to take ψ precisely to ϕ does not mean it can be taken to any $\tilde{\phi}$. Information can be erased at a macroscopic level, but supposedly subsists in environmental records. Unless these are corrupted, as in NPDH, the sets of states to which ψ and φ can be taken will not overlap.

This axiom is only used in the Equivalence Lemma, combined with State Supervenience. Using Solution Continuity one might avoid the need for prefect equality, so it would be enough to get $U\psi$ and $V\varphi$ sufficiently close to each other.

Compatibility. *Acts* $U_i \in \mathcal{U}_{M_i}$*, obtained on mutually orthogonal macrostates* M_i *via Indolence, Reward Availability, Branching Availability or Erasure, can be chosen such that* $U_i = U|_{M_i}$ *for some* $U \in \mathcal{U}_{\dot{\vee}_i M_i}$*.*

As seen in section 3.1.4, acts on different branches are not independent, since their images must be orthogonal, but small adjustments may be enough to obtain such condition. The axiom assumes this can always be done for identity acts, reward acts, branching acts, or erasures, so they can be combined into a single act U.

Problem Continuity may allow such adjustments, but we must question if they alter important characteristics of those acts. Are small errors in the p_i's relevant in Branching Availability? Can the condition $U\psi = V\varphi$ in Erasure be approximate? Also, in NPDH even small changes can bring about lots of new branches.

The axiom does not work for the pair of acts U, V from one application of Erasure, as the arguments for almost orthogonality of the images fail. And suppose U and V were restrictions of a single act. As they send a couple of states from two macrostates into e_r, it is reasonable to assume the whole macrostates end up in e_r. If e_r is a single macrostate (which, as seen, may be necessary in the argument for Erasure), this would contradict Irreversibility. To be fair, this axiom is never used in the proof to combine erasures from the same pair, only from different applications of Erasure, and Wallace's original formulation of that axiom reflects this. But this shows once more how erasures seem endowed with unreasonable capabilities.

3.2.2 Rationality axioms

Ordering. *For each $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\psi \in M$, $\succ_\psi$ is a total order on $\mathcal{U}_M$.*

This corresponds to Completeness and Transitivity from classical decision theory.

Act Nondegeneracy. *There are $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$ and $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_M$ such that $U \succ_\psi V$.*

By this axiom, the agent has a strict preference in at least one case. Wallace omits it, but assumes a consequence, the Reward Nondegeneracy Lemma, saying when it is not valid his result holds trivially. Although that is true, we prefer to obtain the lemma from this axiom, since the Order on Rewards is derived from the order on acts.

Reward Preservation. *Let $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $M \in \mathcal{M}$ with $M \subset r$, $\psi \in M$, and $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$. If $U\psi \in r$ then $U \sim_\psi \mathbb{1}_M$.*

Wallace calls this axiom Branching Indifference, justifying it only for branching acts. But his formal statement implies the agent is indifferent to all acts preserving r, irrespective of their nature. This reflects Rewards as Preferences, which, as seen in section 3.1.3, can not be assumed from the start, and does not serve as justification.

It is used only with branching acts and erasures, requiring Rewards as Payoffs to ensure $U\psi \in r$. We replace it by a new version of Branching Indifference, plus Erasure Indifference, which, being more specialized, might be easier to justify.

Branching Indifference. *Let $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $M \in \mathcal{M}$ with $M \subset r$, and $\psi \in M$. If $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$ is a branching act then $U \sim_\psi \mathbb{1}_M$.*

This is closer to Wallace's idea, that "an agent doesn't care about branching per se: if a certain operation leaves his future selves in N different macrostates but doesn't change any of their rewards, he is indifferent as to whether or not the operation is performed" [Wal12, p.170]. That this may seem reasonable is due to the ambiguity of the term rewards. As seen in Branching Availability, if Rewards as Payoffs is valid then $\mathcal{O}_U \subset r$, but preferences may vary inside r. Under Rewards as Preferences, the agent is indifferent to acts preserving r, but a branching act may have $\mathcal{O}_U \not\subset r$.

Why would the agent care about U, if it does not alter payoffs? Maybe for banal reasons, like the work or time spent to perform the extra experiment. Or he may think, as in section 2.6, that U alters the relevance of the sets of branches with each payoff.

Wallace also says that "a preference order which is not indifferent to branching per se would in practice be impossible to act on: branching is uncontrollable and ever-present in an Everettian universe" [Wal12, p.170]. This seems at odds with his view that the wild proliferation of branches is tamed by coarse graining. Anyway, as seen in section 2.5, it may be impossible to act rationally under Everettian conditions.

Erasure Indifference. *Let $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $M \in \mathcal{M}$ with $M \subset r$, and $\psi \in M$. If $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$ is an erasure then $U \sim_\psi \mathbb{1}_M$.*

It is not clear why the agent would be indifferent to erasures, which may require a lot of work to erase all records of the bet from the environment, and even his own memory. That they do not alter payoffs is not enough, for the same reasons as above.

Erasures are used in the Equivalence Lemma, with State Supervenience, to ensure the agent is indifferent between bets taking him to the same $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Suppose a betting process is enjoyable, while another is unpleasant, but they are otherwise equivalent. The agent might prefer not to include erasures in his decision, as they might lead him to choose an awful course of action, or forego a nice one, only because in the end he will forget it. Or, having suffered through a bad bet, he might in the end prefer to use an erasure and forget about it. In any case, he is not indifferent to erasures.

State Supervenience. *Let* $M, M' \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$, $\psi' \in M'$, $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_M$ *and* $U', V' \in \mathcal{U}_{M'}$. *If* $U\psi = U'\psi'$ *and* $V\psi = V'\psi'$ *then* $U \succ_\psi V \Leftrightarrow U' \succ_{\psi'} V'$.

So preferences can not depend on the acts or initial states, only on the final ones. In particular, $U\psi = V\psi$ implies $U \sim_\psi V$. Wallace argues [Wal12, p.171] that U and V differ only on states the agent should not care about, for not being the actual one. But, he notes, this could be a limitation of the formalism, which does not detail the evolution process, and DH might give us more flexibility. But he says the agent would have to be indifferent "to the size of the temporal gaps between history projectors", and as "we consider sequences of decisions made only over very short periods of time", this "entails that acts can be represented by single unitary transformations".

This is not convincing. Bets are not so quick that nothing relevant can happen in the process. In Wallace's proof they have intermediary steps, with branching acts and erasures, which we are not sure to be irrelevant. Even if there is no natural choice of temporal gap, this should not keep us from placing quantum sample spaces at steps we deem relevant. For example, the agent might prefer a bet with a single quantum measurement than another requiring two, as the first is quicker and takes less work, even if they lead to the same payoffs, with the same Born weights. This can easily be considered in the decision by adding one intermediary step in the histories. Another possibility is using time dependent evolution operators $U(t)$ to detail the process. This would be an idealization, as no agent can compute these, but the same holds for any act U describing the evolution of a macroscopic system.

Wallace does not explain why the initial state is irrelevant. Suppose the agent has a choice of two acts, one giving a \$10,000 payoff, the other leading to a superposition of \$0 and \$1,000,000 branches. It is conceivable that his preference might depend on whether he had initially \$0 (and could find the certainty of \$10,000 very tempting) or \$1,000,000 (in which case he might consider \$10,000 as insignificant as \$0).

An argument could be that the final state includes environmental records and the agent's memories of the bet and initial state. But this fails in NPDH, where records are unreliable, and with Erasure, which destroys memories and records. This axiom is used after erasures, in the Equivalence Lemma.

In classical decision theory, lotteries (9) are set in terms of rewards and probabilities, with no description of the process or initial state. This simplification is usually harmless, as our intuition allows us to adjust the model, including factors like time spent or effort in the description of rewards. In the Everettian case we can not count on intuition, and, as discussed in section 3.1.3, we can not include, in the definition of rewards, all relevant factors, as we do not know what these are.

Definition (Accessible States)**.** Let $E \in \mathcal{E}$. A $\varphi \in E$ is *accessible* (from ψ, via U) if there are $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$ and $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$ such that $\mathcal{O}_U \subset E$ and $U\psi = \varphi$.

So a state is accessible if it can be reached from a non-branched state, via some act.

Non-branched states are trivially accessible, and, assuming the decision problem starts at a macrostate, all states of interest should be accessible. We extend $\succ_\psi$, which was only defined at non-branched states, to accessible ones[16].

Definition (Extended Order)**.** Let $\varphi \in E$ ($E \in \mathcal{E}$) be accessible from $\psi \in M$ ($M \in \mathcal{M}$) via $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$. For $V, V' \in \mathcal{U}_E$, we write $V \succ_\varphi V'$ when $VU \succ_\psi V'U$.

By State Supervenience, $\succ_\varphi$ does not depend on ψ, M or U, and by Ordering it is a total order. It coincides with the original order if $E \in \mathcal{M}$.

This order corresponds to part of Wallace's Diachronic Consistency axiom, which "rules out the possibility of a conflict of interest between an agent and his future selves", since "an agent's actions take time to carry out... if his preferences do not remain consistent over this timescale, deliberative action is not possible at all" [Wal12, p.168]. If the agent prefers, at first, VU over $V'U$, but after doing U changes his mind and does V' instead of V, he ends up at his initially least preferred result. This part of the axiom needs no justification if one accepts State Supervenience.

Definition (Null Event)**.** Let $E, F \in \mathcal{E}$, and $\varphi \in F$ be accessible. We say E is *null* at φ if $U \sim_\varphi V$ for any $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_F$ such that $U|_{E^\perp} = V|_{E^\perp}$.

So E is null at φ if the agent, at this state, is indifferent to what happens on E, as long as it does not affect its complement. As we show, this last condition is quite strong in the quantum case. Wallace claims[17] [Wal12, p.178] nullity has the following properties, for any $E_1, E_2, F \in \mathcal{E}$ and any accessible state $\varphi \in F$:

Null Subevent. *If E_1 is null at φ, and $E_2 \subset E_1$, then E_2 is null at φ.*

Null Disjunction. *If E_1 and E_2 are null at φ then $E_1 \vee E_2$ is null at φ.*

These have classical counterparts (Appendix A.3), and the first one is immediate. The second seems intuitive: if the agent does not care about E_1 or E_2, he should not care about $E_1 \vee E_2$. The classical proof uses the fact that classical acts (functions mapping states to payoffs) at an event and at its complement are independent. It does not adapt to the quantum case, where acts (unitary maps) at E usually affect $E^\perp$. In fact, Null Disjunction seems wrong. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and V, W be acts with $V|_{M^\perp} = W|_{M^\perp}$. Then $W = VU$, with $U|_{M^\perp} = \mathbb{1}_{M^\perp}$. By unitarity, $U(M) \subset M$, so U only moves states inside M. As the agent is indifferent to states of M, we should have $U \sim_\varphi \mathbb{1}$ and $W \sim_\varphi V$, for all φ. So macrostates are always null, which seems fair: M is too coarse if the agent cares about states moving in it. Null Disjunction extends this to disjunctions of macrostates, which is not plausible, as the agent may care about states switching macrostates. This also contradicts the Nullity Lemma, which uses the properties.

The rest of Walace's Diachronic Consistency is a different idea, which got mixed with it as he only defined $\succ_\psi$ at macrostates. We present it as the following axiom.

Branch Independence. *Let $E \in \mathcal{E}$ have a partition $E = \dot{\vee}_i M_i$ with $M_i \in \mathcal{M}$. Given an accessible $\varphi \in E$, and $V, V' \in \mathcal{U}_E$, let $V_i = V|_{M_i}$, $V'_i = V'|_{M_i}$ and $\varphi_i = \Pi_{M_i}\varphi$. Then:*

- *if $V_i \succsim_{\varphi_i} V'_i$ for all i with M_i not null at φ then $V \succsim_\varphi V'$;*
- *if, in addition, $V_i \succ_{\varphi_i} V'_i$ for some i, with M_i not null at φ, then $V \succ_\varphi V'$.*

This is reminiscent of the classical Independence condition. It relates the order at a branched state to preferences at its branches, when all the agent's versions agree. If, for all of them, the act corresponding to V, via restriction, is preferred, or equivalent, to that given by V', then V is preferred, or equivalent, to V'. And it becomes a strict preference if it is so in at least one branch that the agent cares about, i.e. non-null.

---

[16] In [Wal12, p.166], Wallace says $\succ$ would be an order on acts at events, but he only defines it at macrostates.

[17] He mentions sets and unions, but it is clear he wants the properties to hold for events and disjunctions.

Perhaps the condition of M_i not being null at φ should be replaced by it being nonorthogonal to φ. If this means φ has a branch in M_i, it seems reasonable the agent should care about it. This would allow the axiom to be used in the Dominance Lemma despite the problem with the Nullity Lemma.

If $E \in \mathcal{M}$ (so the M_i's are a refinement of it), and $V_i \succ_{\varphi_i} V_i'$ for some i, it seems the same should hold for all i, as all states of E are similar. The axiom implies $V \succ_\varphi V'$, so refinements and coarsenings preserve preferences. With the Orthogonality Condition, different partitions of $E \in \mathcal{E}$ have a common refinement, so if the same preference between V and V' is held in all branches of a partition, it is also held in any other. So the axiom never leads to conflicting results, depending on the partition used. Without that condition, another partition might have branches physically very different from the φ_i's, as seen in section 3.1.2. Preferences might be reversed in them, leading to $V \prec_\varphi V'$. We note that this problem also happens in Wallace's original formulation.

Macrostate Indifference. *Let $M, M', N_1, N_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$, $\psi' \in M'$, $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_M$, $U', V' \in \mathcal{U}_{M'}$, and $r_1, r_2 \in \mathcal{R}$. If $\mathcal{O}_U, \mathcal{O}_{U'} \subset N_1 \wedge r_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_V, \mathcal{O}_{V'} \subset N_2 \wedge r_2$, then $U \succcurlyeq_\psi V \Leftrightarrow U' \succcurlyeq_{\psi'} V'$.*

Wallace's informal description is that "an agent doesn't care what the microstate is provided it's within a particular macrostate" [Wal12, p.170]. Decisions can not depend on microscopic details, for the agent has no such fine control, and if two states are different enough to affect his preferences, they should be in distinct macrostates.

If $M = M'$, $U = U'$ and $V = V'$, we get $U \succcurlyeq_\psi V \Leftrightarrow U \succcurlyeq_{\psi'} V$, so preferences do not depend on the initial microstates. If $M = M'$ and $\psi = \psi'$, we find that the final ones do not matter either. This agrees with the informal description, but the formal statement is much stronger. It allows $M \neq M'$, so preferences can not even depend on the initial macrostates. Nor on acts, as with $\psi = \psi'$, $N_1 = N_2$, $r_1 = r_2$, $U = V'$ and $V = U'$ we get that all acts sending ψ into $N_1 \wedge r_1$ are equally preferred. Basically, preference between acts, with images in sets of the form $N \wedge r$, depends only on these. This needs further justification, perhaps along the lines of State Supervenience.

We note that Wallace's use of $N \wedge r$ is strange. As discussed in section 3.1.3, can some microstates of N be in r and others not? If so, can the agent distinguish them?

Wallace says [Wal12, p.180] the axiom is used, with Reward Availability and Reward Preservation, to define the Order on Rewards[18]. He does not elaborate, but extending the equivalence of preferences from $N \wedge r$ to the whole r may also need State Supervenience. And, as not all states of r might be connected via some available U, it may not be enough. We got that order by other means, and did not use the axiom at all.

Solution Continuity. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$ and $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_M$. If $U \succ_\psi V$ then $U' \succ_\psi V'$ for any $U', V' \in \mathcal{U}_M$ sufficiently close (in the operator norm) to U and V.*

Small perturbations of acts can not alter preferences, if rational decisions are to be possible, as agents can not distinguish arbitrarily close acts, nor execute them with microscopic precision. But branch discontinuities allow even small changes to create completely new branches, which might affect the decision. So lack of fine control could mean rationality is really not possible, in accordance with section 2.5.

This axiom is only used in the Utility Lemma, with Standard Acts. Restricted to these it seems reasonable, except, perhaps, at standard acts of weights 0 or 1, due to branch discontinuities. But the agent can never execute standard acts with absolute precision, and even tiny deviations could have important consequences.

---

[18] He also says it could be used to obtain his version of Branching Indifference, if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{E}$.

3.3 Proof

We present Wallace's proof assuming all problems with axioms and concepts can be fixed. It was reorganized to highlight parallels with the classical decision under risk (Appendix A.2). We used a more explicit notation, filled in details and clarified some points, but the idea is essentially the same as Wallace's. Use of axioms is clearly indicated, except for Restriction, Indolence, Composition, and Ordering, which are quite simple and ubiquitous. Here we use normalized states to simplify the notation. The reader is invited to check this is nowhere related to a probabilistic interpretation.

The first lemma shows preference on bets (represented by acts U_1, U_2, V_1 and V_2) depends only on the norms of projections of the final states (so, on their Born weights) on reward subspaces. It corresponds, classically, to the assumption, expressed in (9), that in decisions about lotteries all that matters are the probabilities of their rewards.

Equivalence Lemma. *Let* $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}$*,* $\psi_1 \in M_1$*,* $\psi_2 \in M_2$*,* $U_1, V_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{M_1}$*,* $U_2, V_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{M_2}$*, and suppose, for all* $r \in \mathcal{R}$*,* $|\Pi_r U_1 \psi_1| = |\Pi_r U_2 \psi_2|$ *and* $|\Pi_r V_1 \psi_1| = |\Pi_r V_2 \psi_2|$*. Then* $U_1 \succ_{\psi_1} V_1 \Leftrightarrow U_2 \succ_{\psi_2} V_2$*.*

Proof. We organize the proof in 4 steps.

Step 1) We use branching acts $W_{1,r,i}$ and $W_{2,r,j}$ to split branches $\varphi_{1,r,i}$ and $\varphi_{2,r,j}$ of $U_1\psi_1$ and $U_2\psi_2$, in reward r, into new ones $\phi_{1,r,i,j}$ and $\phi_{2,r,j,i}$ of equal Born weights.

Let $\varphi_1 = U_1\psi_1$, $\varphi_2 = U_2\psi_2$, $E_1 = \mathcal{O}_{U_1}$, $E_2 = \mathcal{O}_{U_2}$, $R = \{r \in \mathcal{R} : \Pi_r \varphi_1 \neq 0\}$, and, for each $r \in R$, let $\varphi_{1,r} = \Pi_r \varphi_1$, $\varphi_{2,r} = \Pi_r \varphi_2$, $E_{1,r} = \Pi_r E_1$ and $E_{2,r} = \Pi_r E_2$[19]. Given a partition $\{M_{1,r,i}\}$ of $E_{1,r}$, let $\varphi_{1,r,i} = \Pi_{M_{1,r,i}} \varphi_{1,r}$ and $I_r = \{i : \varphi_{1,r,i} \neq 0\}$. And, for a partition $\{M_{2,r,j}\}$ of $E_{2,r}$, let $\varphi_{2,r,j} = \Pi_{M_{2,r,j}} \varphi_{2,r}$ and $J_r = \{j : \varphi_{2,r,j} \neq 0\}$.

For $i \in I_r$ and $j \in J_r$, let $p_{r,i} = |\varphi_{1,r,i}|^2/|\varphi_{1,r}|^2$ and $q_{r,j} = |\varphi_{2,r,j}|^2/|\varphi_{2,r}|^2$. Branching Availability gives $W_{1,r,i} \in \mathcal{U}_{M_{1,r,i}}$ such that $\mathcal{O}_{W_{1,r,i}} \subset r$ has a partition $\{N_{1,r,i,j}\}_{j \in J_r}$ with $|\phi_{1,r,i,j}|^2 = |\varphi_{1,r,i}|^2 \cdot q_{r,j}$, where $\phi_{1,r,i,j} = \Pi_{N_{1,r,i,j}} W_{1,r,i} \varphi_{1,r,i}$. We also get $W_{2,r,j} \in \mathcal{U}_{M_{2,r,j}}$ with $\mathcal{O}_{W_{2,r,j}} \subset r$ having a partition $\{N_{2,r,j,i}\}_{i \in I_r}$ such that $|\phi_{2,r,j,i}|^2 = p_{r,i} \cdot |\varphi_{2,r,j}|^2$, where $\phi_{2,r,j,i} = \Pi_{N_{2,r,j,i}} W_{2,r,j} \varphi_{2,r,j}$. By hypothesis $|\varphi_{1,r}| = |\varphi_{2,r}|$, so we have

$$|\phi_{1,r,i,j}| = \frac{|\varphi_{1,r,i}| \cdot |\varphi_{2,r,j}|}{|\varphi_{2,r}|} = |\phi_{2,r,j,i}|. \tag{8}$$

For $i \notin I_r$ or $j \notin J_r$, let $W_{1,r,i} = \mathbb{1}_{M_{1,r,i}}$ and $W_{2,r,j} = \mathbb{1}_{M_{2,r,j}}$.

Step 2) The $W_{1,r,i}$'s (resp. $W_{2,r,j}$'s) are combined into W_1 (resp. W_2). Irreversibility ensures the $\phi_{1,r,i,j}$'s (resp. $\phi_{2,r,j,i}$'s) remain as branches of $W_1 U_1 \psi_1$ (resp. $W_2 U_2 \psi_2$).

Compatibility gives $W_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{E_1}$, $W_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{E_2}$ with $W_1|_{M_{1,r,i}} = W_{1,r,i}$ and $W_2|_{M_{2,r,j}} = W_{2,r,j}$. By Irreversibility, the $\mathcal{O}_{W_{1,r,i}}$'s are mutually orthogonal, as are the $\mathcal{O}_{W_{2,r,j}}$'s. So $\Pi_{N_{1,r,i,j}} \phi_1 = \phi_{1,r,i,j}$, and $\Pi_{N_{2,r,j,i}} \phi_2 = \phi_{2,r,j,i}$, where $\phi_1 = W_1 \varphi_1$ and $\phi_2 = W_2 \varphi_2$. Also,

$$\mathcal{O}_{W_1} = \dot{\bigvee_{r,i}} \mathcal{O}_{W_{1,r,i}} = \dot{\bigvee_{r \in R}} \left[\left(\dot{\bigvee_{i \in I_r, j \in J_r}} N_{1,r,i,j} \right) \dot{\vee} \left(\dot{\bigvee_{i \notin I_r}} M_{1,r,i} \right) \right],$$

with a similar decomposition for $\mathcal{O}_{W_2}$.

---

[19] The Orthogonality Condition ensures $\Pi_r \mathcal{O}_U = \mathcal{O}_U \wedge r$, so that $E_{1,r}, E_{2,r} \in \mathcal{E}$.

Step 3) We use erasures to eliminate the differences between $\phi_{1,r,i,j}$ and $\phi_{2,r,j,i}$, and combine them into acts X_1 and X_2 such that $X_1 W_1 U_1 \psi_1 = X_2 W_2 U_2 \psi_2$.

By (8), Erasure gives $X_{1,r,i,j} \in \mathcal{U}_{N_{1,r,i,j}}$ and $X_{2,r,j,i} \in \mathcal{U}_{N_{2,r,j,i}}$ with $\mathcal{O}_{X_{1,r,i,j}}, \mathcal{O}_{X_{2,r,j,i}} \subset r$ and $X_{1,r,i,j}\phi_{1,r,i,j} = X_{2,r,j,i}\phi_{2,r,j,i}$. Compatibility gives $X_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_{W_1}}$ and $X_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_{W_2}}$ such that $X_1|_{N_{1,r,i,j}} = X_{1,r,i,j}$ and $X_2|_{N_{2,r,j,i}} = X_{2,r,j,i}$ for $i \in I_r$ and $j \in J_r$, $X_1|_{M_{1,r,i}} = \mathbb{1}_{M_{1,r,i}}$ for $i \notin I_r$, and $X_2|_{M_{2,r,j}} = \mathbb{1}_{M_{2,r,j}}$ for $j \notin J_r$. By construction, $X_1\phi_1 = X_2\phi_2$.

Step 4) The agent is indifferent to the branchings W and erasures X. They take the $U\psi$'s to the same final state, and a similar procedure can be done to the $V\psi$'s, so the preferences between the U's and the V's must agree.

By Branching Indifference and Erasure Indifference we have $W_{1,r,i} \sim_{\varphi_{1,r,i}} \mathbb{1}_{M_{1,r,i}}$, $W_{2,r,j} \sim_{\varphi_{2,r,i}} \mathbb{1}_{M_{2,r,j}}$, $X_{1,r,i,j} \sim_{\phi_{1,r,i,j}} \mathbb{1}_{N_{1,r,i,j}}$ and $X_{2,r,j,i} \sim_{\phi_{2,r,j,i}} \mathbb{1}_{N_{2,r,j,i}}$. Therefore Branch Independence gives $W_1 \sim_{\varphi_1} \mathbb{1}_{E_1}$, $W_2 \sim_{\varphi_2} \mathbb{1}_{E_2}$, $X_1 \sim_{\phi_1} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_{W_1}}$ and $X_2 \sim_{\phi_2} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_{W_2}}$.

Let $U_1' = X_1 W_1$ and $U_2' = X_2 W_2$. Then $U_1' U_1 \psi_1 = U_2' U_2 \psi_2$, and, by the Extended Order, $U_1' U_1 \sim_{\psi_1} U_1$ and $U_2' U_2 \sim_{\psi_2} U_2$. Likewise, we can get $V_1' \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_{V_1}}$ and $V_2' \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_{V_2}}$ with $V_1' V_1 \psi_1 = V_2' V_2 \psi_2$, $V_1' V_1 \sim_{\psi_1} V_1$ and $V_2' V_2 \sim_{\psi_2} V_2$. Finally, State Supervenience gives $U_1' U_1 \succ_{\psi_1} V_1' V_1 \Leftrightarrow U_2' U_2 \succ_{\psi_2} V_2' V_2$. ☐

Corollary 1. *Let $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{E}$, $\varphi_1 \in E_1$ and $\varphi_2 \in E_2$ be accessible states, $U_1, V_1 \in \mathcal{U}_{E_1}$, and $U_2, V_2 \in \mathcal{U}_{E_2}$. If, for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $|\Pi_r U_1 \varphi_1| = |\Pi_r U_2 \varphi_2|$ and $|\Pi_r V_1 \varphi_1| = |\Pi_r V_2 \varphi_2|$, then $U_1 \succ_{\varphi_1} V_1 \Leftrightarrow U_2 \succ_{\varphi_2} V_2$.*

Corollary 2. *Let $E \in \mathcal{E}$, $\varphi \in E$ be accessible, and $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_E$. If $|\Pi_r U\varphi| = |\Pi_r V\varphi|$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ then $U \sim_\varphi V$.*

This allows us to get a preference on rewards from that on acts. It might justify Rewards as Preferences, if not for the use of axioms depending on that characterization. Classically, this order comes from identifying rewards with simple lotteries.

Definition (Order on Rewards)**.** We write $r \succ s$, for $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$, if $U \succ_\psi V$ for all accessible $\psi \in E$ ($E \in \mathcal{E}$) and $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_E$ such that $U\psi \in r$ and $V\psi \in s$.

By Corollary 1, it is enough that $U \succ_\psi V$ for some ψ, E, U, V satisfying those conditions, and by Reward Availability and Ordering this is a total order on $\mathcal{R}$.

As usual classically, Wallace assumes the next result as valid, to have a nontrivial problem. But in the quantum case the order on rewards is derived from that on acts, so it is best to get its nondegeneracy from the more basic one on acts.

Reward Nondegeneracy Lemma. *There are $r, s \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $r \succ s$.*

Proof. Fix $s \in \mathcal{R}$, and suppose $r \sim s$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Act Nondegeneracy gives $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$ and $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_M$ such that $U \succ_\psi V$. Partitioning each $r \in \mathcal{R}$ into macrostates, let $\{M_i\}$ be the set of all those with $\varphi_i = \Pi_{M_i} U\psi \neq 0$. Reward Availability gives, for each i, some $W_i \in \mathcal{U}_{M_i}$ with $\mathcal{O}_{W_i} \subset s$. The Order on Rewards implies $W_i \sim_{\varphi_i} \mathbb{1}_{M_i}$. Compatibility gives $W \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_U}$ such that $W|_{M_i} = W_i$, and Branch Independence implies $W \sim_{U\psi} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{O}_U}$. Then $WU\psi \in s$, and, by the Extended Order, $WU \sim_\psi U$. Likewise, we obtain W' with $W'V\psi \in s$ and $W'V \sim_\psi V$. By Corollary 2, $WU \sim_\psi W'V$, so that $U \sim_\psi V$, contradicting their choice. ☐

Definition (Extremal Rewards)**.** We fix $r_0, r_1 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $r_0 \prec r_1$ and $r_0 \preccurlyeq r \preccurlyeq r_1$ for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$.

Existence of r_0 and r_1 is assured by the previous lemma and the finiteness of $\mathcal{R}$. As Wallace assumes no such condition, his original proof requires some technical workarounds, which are usual in the classical theory.

The next lemma characterizes a Null Event, showing the only way an agent will not care about an event is if it contains no branches. As discussed before, it may be incorrect. This is the only part of the proof whose classical parallel is in the case of decision under uncertainty (Appendix A.3). It appears because, instead of lotteries, Wallace uses a framework of acts and events, typical of that case.

Nullity Lemma. *$E \in \mathcal{E}$ is null at an accessible state ψ if, and only if,* $\Pi_E \psi = 0$.

Proof. If $\Pi_E \psi = 0$ then $U|_{E^\perp} = V|_{E^\perp}$ gives $U\psi = V\psi$. By State Supervenience $U \sim_\psi V$, so E is null.

Now suppose E is null at ψ, but $|\Pi_E \psi|^2 = \alpha \neq 0$. With Reward Availability and Compatibility, we can construct $U, V \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{O}_U \subset r_0$, $V(E) \subset r_1$, and $V|_{E^\perp} = U|_{E^\perp}$. As E is null, $V \sim_\psi U$. Given any other E' and ψ' with $|\Pi_{E'}\psi'|^2 = \alpha$, we can also obtain $U', V' \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{O}_{U'} \subset r_0$, $V'(E') \subset r_1$, and $V'|_{E'^\perp} = U'|_{E'^\perp}$. By Corollary 1, $V' \sim_{\psi'} U'$. But Branch Independence and Order on Rewards would imply $V' \succ_{\psi'} U'$, unless E' is also null at ψ'. This shows that, whenever $|\Pi_E \psi| = |\Pi_{E'}\psi'|$, E is null at ψ if, and only if, E' is null at ψ'.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $1/n < \alpha$. With Branching Availability we obtain ϕ and U such that $\mathcal{O}_U = M_1 \dot\vee M_2 \dot\vee M_3$, $|\Pi_{M_1} U\phi|^2 = 1/n, |\Pi_{M_2} U\phi|^2 = \alpha - 1/n$, and $|\Pi_{M_3} U\phi|^2 = 1 - \alpha$. Since $|\Pi_{M_1 \dot\vee M_2} U\phi|^2 = \alpha$, $M_1 \dot\vee M_2$ is null at $U\phi$. By Null Subevent, so is M_1. Hence any M is null at any ψ in which $|\Pi_M \psi|^2 = 1/n$.

With Branching Availability, we get another ϕ and U with $\mathcal{O}_U = M_1 \dot\vee \ldots \dot\vee M_n$ and $|\Pi_{M_i} U\phi|^2 = 1/n$ for all i. As the M_i's are null at $U\phi$, by Null Disjunction so is $\mathcal{O}_U$. Reward Availability and Compatibility give $V, W \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_U}$ with $\mathcal{O}_V \subset r_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_W \subset r_0$. By the Order on Rewards, $V \succ_{U\phi} W$, contradicting the nullity of $\mathcal{O}_U$. ☐

We now define the quantum equivalent of the standard lotteries (10).

Definition (Standard Acts)**.** Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. A *standard act of weight α at ψ* is an $U_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_M$ such that $\mathcal{O}_{U_\alpha} \subset r_0 \dot\vee r_1$ and $|\Pi_{r_1} U_\alpha \psi|^2 = \alpha$.

These can always be obtained by Branching Availability and Reward Availability. If this could be done in a way that U_α depends continuously on α (which seems feasible), we might no longer need the Problem Continuity axiom.

The next result corresponds to the classical Monotonicity.

Dominance Lemma. *Let U_α and U_β be standard acts of weights α and β at ψ. Then $\alpha > \beta \Leftrightarrow U_\alpha \succ_\psi U_\beta$.*

Proof. If $\alpha > \beta$ then, using Branching Availability, we can obtain φ and U such that $\mathcal{O}_U = M_1 \dot\vee M_2 \dot\vee M_3$ and, letting $\phi_i = \Pi_{M_i}\phi$ for $\phi = U\varphi$,

$$|\phi_1|^2 = \beta, \qquad |\phi_2|^2 = \alpha - \beta, \qquad |\phi_3|^2 = 1 - \alpha.$$

By Reward Availability and Compatibility, there are $V, W \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{O}_U}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{lll} V(M_1) \subset r_1, & V(M_2) \subset r_1, & V(M_3) \subset r_0, \\ W(M_1) \subset r_1, & W(M_2) \subset r_0, & W(M_3) \subset r_0. \end{array}$$

The Order on Rewards implies $V|_{M_1} \sim_{\phi_1} W|_{M_1}$, $V|_{M_2} \succ_{\phi_2} W|_{M_2}$, and $V|_{M_3} \sim_{\phi_3} W|_{M_3}$. By the Nullity Lemma, M_2 is not null at ϕ, so Branch Independence gives $V \succ_\phi W$. The Extended Order implies $VU \succ_\varphi WU$, and by the Equivalence Lemma $U_\alpha \succ_\psi U_\beta$.

If $\alpha = \beta$ then $U_\alpha \sim_\psi U_\beta$, by Corollary 2. The converse follows via Ordering. $\square$

The next lemma forms an *utility function* $u(r)$ by comparing standard acts with simple acts V_r (which lead to a single r), as in the classical case.

Utility Lemma. *There is an unique*[20] $u : \mathcal{R} \to [0, 1]$, *with* $u(r_0) = 0$ *and* $u(r_1) = 1$, *such that* $U_{u(r)} \sim_\psi V_r$ *for any* $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $\psi \in M$ $(M \in \mathcal{M})$, *any standard act* $U_{u(r)}$ *of weight* $u(r)$ *at* ψ, *and any act* V_r *with* $V_r\psi \in r$. *Moreover,* $u(r) > u(s) \Leftrightarrow r \succ s$.

Proof. For any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$, $r \in \mathcal{R}$, and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, there are, by Branching Availability and Reward Availability, a standard act $U_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_M$ of weight α at ψ, and an act $V_r \in \mathcal{U}_M$ with $V_r\psi \in r$. By the Equivalence Lemma, the definition

$$u(r) = \sup\{\alpha : U_\alpha \preccurlyeq_\psi V_r\},$$

does not depend on the choice of ψ, V_r or U_α. By construction, $U_\alpha \succ_\psi V_r$ if $\alpha > u(r)$, and by the Dominance Lemma $U_\alpha \prec_\psi V_r$ if $\alpha < u(r)$.

Suppose $U_{u(r)} \succ_\psi V_r$. Then $u(r) \neq 0$, or the Order on Rewards would give $r_0 \succ r$. By Solution Continuity, $U \succ_\psi V_r$ for all U in a neighborhood of $U_{u(r)}$. For $\alpha < u(r)$ close enough to $u(r)$, we can assume U_α is in this neighborhood (if necessary, using Problem Continuity to get U_α as a perturbation of $U_{u(r)}$), contradicting $U_\alpha \prec_\psi V_r$. By a similar argument it is not possible that $U_{u(r)} \prec_\psi V_r$. So $U_{u(r)} \sim_\psi V_r$, and by the Equivalence Lemma this holds for any other acts with the conditions of the lemma.

The Dominance Lemma and the Order on Rewards imply that $u(r) > u(s) \Leftrightarrow U_{u(r)} \succ_\psi U_{u(s)} \Leftrightarrow V_r \succ_\psi V_s \Leftrightarrow r \succ s$. To prove unicity, let $\tilde{u}$ be another utility function. Then $U_{\tilde{u}(r)} \sim_\psi V_r \sim_\psi U_{u(r)}$, and by the Dominance Lemma $\tilde{u}(r) = u(r)$. $\square$

The definition of expected utility (11), from classical decision theory, is adapted with Born weights in place of probabilities.

Definition (Expected Utility)**.** The *expected utility* of an act U at a state ψ is

$$\mathrm{EU}_\psi(U) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} |\Pi_r U\psi|^2 \cdot u(r).$$

For standard acts, $\mathrm{EU}(U_\alpha) = \alpha$. The next lemma shows any act is equivalent to a standard act of equal expected utility. It corresponds to the use of Substitutability in the proof of the Von Neumann-Morgenstern Theorem (VNM).

Standard Act Lemma. *Let* $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\psi \in M$, $U \in \mathcal{U}_M$. *Then* $U \sim_\psi U_\alpha$, *where* U_α *is a standard act of weight* $\alpha = \mathrm{EU}_\psi(U)$ *at* ψ.

Proof. Let $\{M_{r,i}\}$ be a partition of $r \in \mathcal{R}$ in macrostates, $\varphi = U\psi$, and $\varphi_{r,i} = \Pi_{M_{r,i}}\varphi$. With Branching Availability, Reward Availability and Compatibility we get $W \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{H}$ such that $W|_{M_{r,i}}$ is a standard act of weight $u(r)$ at $\frac{\varphi_{r,i}}{|\varphi_{r,i}|}$ if $\varphi_{r,i} \neq 0$, and $W|_{M_{r,i}} = \mathbb{1}_{M_{r,i}}$ if $\varphi_{r,i} = 0$. Then $|\Pi_{r_1} W\varphi_{r,i}|^2 = u(r) \cdot |\varphi_{r,i}|^2$, so that[21]

$$|\Pi_{r_1} WU\psi|^2 = \left|\sum_{r,i} \Pi_{r_1} W\varphi_{r,i}\right|^2 = \sum_{r,i} |\Pi_{r_1} W\varphi_{r,i}|^2 = \sum_r u(r) \cdot |\Pi_r\varphi|^2 = \mathrm{EU}_\psi(U),$$

and WU is a standard act of weight $\mathrm{EU}_\psi(U)$ at ψ. As the Utility Lemma implies $W|_{M_{r,i}} \sim_{\varphi_{r,i}} \mathbb{1}_{M_{r,i}}$, Branch Independence and the Extended Order give $U \sim_\psi WU$. $\square$

---

[20] Other values of $u(r_0)$ or $u(r_1)$ allow for positive affine transformations, as in the classical theory.

[21] The second equality requires orthogonality, which comes from the use of Compatibility to obtain W.

Finally, as preference on standard acts increases with their expected utilities, the same holds for all other acts, and we obtain the quantum equivalent of VNM.

Born Rule Theorem. $U \succ_\psi V \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{EU}_\psi(U) > \mathrm{EU}_\psi(V)$.

Proof. By the Standard Act Lemma, U and V are equivalent to standard acts of weights $\mathrm{EU}_\psi(U)$ and $\mathrm{EU}_\psi(V)$ at ψ, so the Dominance Lemma gives the result. $\square$

Except for the use of Born weights instead of probabilities in EU, this corresponds to the Principle of Maximization of Expected Utility, justifying the Born Strategy. So, for rational decisions in EQM, Born weights work as if they were probabilities.

4 Comparison with the classical cases

As the technical details of the proof can obfuscate its idea, we now discuss simple examples in comparison with classical decision theory. We take only three rewards $r_0 \prec r \prec r_1$, and set utilities $u(r_0) = 0$ and $u(r_1) = 1$ as reference values.

1. In the classical decision under risk (Appendix A.2), take standard bets B_p which give r_1 with probability p, otherwise give r_0. If the agent's preference increases continuously with p, there will be some p_r for which he will consider B_{p_r} as good as receiving r with certainty. This is taken as a measure of his interest in r, and called a (subjective) utility $u(r)$.

   Given a bet A, with probabilities α_0, α_r and α_1 for r_0, r and r_1, let A' be identical to it, except that the event that would give r now leads to a secondary bet B_{p_r}. As the agent is indifferent between r and B_{p_r}, the same should hold for A and A'. Since classical probability rules imply A' is equivalent to $B_{\alpha_r p_r + \alpha_1}$, the expected utility $\alpha_r p_r + \alpha_1$ is taken as a measure of the agent's interest in A.

   The example needs the agent to be reasonable enough, with a minimal knowledge of how probabilities work, for his preferences to satisfy the axioms of VNM.

2. In decision under uncertainty (Appendix A.3), the probabilities are unknown. But if the agent's opinions are reasonable, we can first get a subjective likelihood order on events, by checking in which ones he would prefer to receive r_1.

   Then suppose we have a collection of events he considers as unlikely as need be, so his preferences are little affected by what happens in any of them. We can use, for example, roulettes with arbitrarily large numbers of results. Even if the agent thinks they are unfair, Savage proved the events can be combined into new ones he will accept as equally (un)likely. So we might as well assume he believes in their fairness. For a roulette with n results, define standard bets B_m giving r_1 for the first m results, and r_0 for the rest. As m increases, the rewards of some results improve, so the agent's preference should increase gradually.

   Given any event E, let a bet A give r_1 in case of E and r_0 otherwise. If the agent prefers A to B_m until m reaches a certain value, his subjective probability for E is in the interval $[\frac{m}{n}, \frac{m+1}{n}]$. A precise value is obtained via a limiting process. Having his subjective probabilities for all events, we proceed as in the previous case.

   All steps work if the agent is reasonable enough, and has enough knowledge of how probabilities work, for his preferences to satisfy Savage's axioms.

3. In the quantum case, let a standard quantum bet B_w be one in which the agent measures an electron spin, with Born weight w for up, and receives r_1 in branches of spin up, r_0 in those of spin down. For $w' > w$, let B' be a bet where, after B_w, his versions which got r_0 measure a spin with weight $\frac{w'-w}{1-w}$ for up, and in the new up branches the reward is improved to r_1. The weight of r_1 is now w', if there is no interference. If the agent does not think the new measurement alters the relative relevance of the original r_1 branches, does not mind doing the extra experiment, and wants as much r_1 as possible, he should prefer B' over B_w.

   The final state of B' is not the same as if $B_{w'}$ had been done, due to differences in their histories (and maybe in the amount of branches, if it has any meaning). Wallace argues they can be erased without affecting the rewards (via unitary acts, so the weights had to be the same in both states) or the agent minding it. Then he should be indifferent between B' and $B_{w'}$, and prefer $B_{w'}$ over B_w.

   Hence his preference for the B_w's increases with w. If it does so continuously, for some w he will consider B_w as good as receiving r with certainty. This w is taken as the (subjective) utility $u(r)$.

   Let a bet A give r_0, r and r_1 according to the result of a quantum measurement of weights w_0, w_r and w_1. Let A' be similar to A, but in branches where the agent would get r he instead performs a secondary bet $B_{u(r)}$. Under the same assumptions as before, he should be indifferent between A and A'. The weight of r_1 in A' is $w_r u(r) + w_1$, if there is no interference. Erasures allow us to consider A' equivalent to $B_{w_r u(r)+w_1}$, so this weight measures the agent's interest in A. In a parallel with the classical case, Wallace calls it an expected utility, and concludes that, for decision purposes, weights play the same role as probabilities.

   His axioms try to ensure all assumptions made are valid. But some of them assume a knowledge of how branches work that is beyond what we have.

Comparing the examples, we see the quantum case adapts just the first one. In decision under risk, assumptions about the agent's preferences allow us to infer his subjective utilities via probabilities in standard bets, and the result follows from the way classical probabilities combine in successive bets. In the quantum case, assumptions about the agent's preferences allow us to infer his subjective utilities via Born weights in standard quantum bets, and the result follows from the way Born weights combine in successive branchings, if there is no interference.

Decision under uncertainty has extra steps, to get subjective probabilities, not present in Wallace's case. Comparison of his proof with Appendix A.3 shows he takes from Savage little more than the language of events, acts and payoffs. But while Savage sets payoffs apart from states of the world, Wallace identifies rewards with sets of states in which they were given. Acts, which for Savage are any maps from states to payoffs, become unitary maps on states. This affects another concept taken from Savage, nullity, which, as seen, did not adapt well to the quantum case.

It should have been clear, from the start, that the idea that Born weights work as subjective probabilities is incorrect. For if all rational agents use the same weights as probabilities, these can not be considered subjective (unless this term is taken in its broadest sense, to include all we believe to know, which is not the strict sense in which Savage's subjective probabilities are defined).

5 Conclusion

The first reaction to the idea of using decision theory to obtain the Born rule tends to be disbelief. But, upon learning that it provides a formal framework for subjective probabilities, and studying Deutsch's proposal, many find it appealing. We found Wallace's proof to be, for the most part, correct, although some details needed fixing. But concepts and axioms upon which it is based present problems, and the more we delve into the formal details, the less likely it seems that they can be solved.

By their nature, decision theoretic proofs must assume worlds, reasonably similar to ours, emerge from EQM. The details of such hypothesis should be clearly stated. Are all branches like this? Are they orthogonal to each other? Is some interference possible? Is the decomposition unique? How similar to our reality must these worlds be? If they sustain intelligent life, has it evolved to use a reasoning similar to ours, or one better adapted to a branching Universe? Validity of the result depends on the answers being properly justified.

Wallace's assumptions regarding these questions are usually left implicit in his concepts and axioms. He believes branches, resulting from his solution of the preferred basis problem, have all the necessary properties. But, as shown in [Man17], that solution is not valid, since decoherence depends on the probabilistic interpretation of Born weights to justify its approximations. Analysis of what results from combining EQM and the non-probabilistic aspects of the decoherent histories formalism shows branches might not be so well behaved. Some of the problems might be alleviated with the proposed causal histories formalism, if it can be properly developed.

The main problems found in Wallace's concepts, axioms and proof are:

1. Null Disjunction fails in the quantum case, compromising the Nullity Lemma. The rest of the proof still works, if Branch Independence is changed as proposed.
2. Reward subspaces have incompatible characterizations. Reward Availability, and part of Branching Availability and Erasure, need Rewards as Payoffs. But Branching Indifference and Erasure Indifference depend on Rewards as Preferences.
3. Macrostates should emerge from the solution of the preferred basis problem, but Wallace is not clear about all properties expected of them. He gives vague ideas, but his examples, and the formalization of some axioms, seem to contradict them. It is also not clear if they refer only to the system of interest, or if they also specify the macroscopic state of the environment and history records.
4. Wallace assumes mutually orthogonal branches. These are an idealization in the usual decoherent histories formalism, but become highly unstable in its non-probabilistic version. Realistic branch decompositions are almost orthogonal, but even tiny deviations have important consequences, such as:
   - branch decompositions may be non-unique, and not even similar;
   - Branch Independence might lead to contradictory results;
   - there might be macrostates not contained in any reward subspace;
   - not all branches of $U\psi$ might be in $\mathcal{O}_U$, compromising Irreversibility, Reward Availability, Erasure and Macrostate Indifference.
5. Branch discontinuities compromise Solution Continuity e Problem Continuity.
6. Irreversibility and Erasure rely on conflicting claims about preservation of records.
7. The Branching-Consistency Theorem does not extend to history algebras. It only justifies Irreversibility if history records are separated in distinct macrostates.

8. Typical branches might not be like our world, and complex structures needed for decision theory might not exist, or not behave as usual. This compromises Reward Availability, Branching Availability, and Erasure, which depend on a narrative in which agents exist, and their actions have the expected consequences.
9. Rationality might be impossible in an Everettian universe, compromising part of the justification for Branching Indifference and Solution Continuity.
10. Impossibility of branch counting does not justify Branching Indifference, as there might exist other measures not preserved by branchings.
11. Use of Reward Availability, Branching Availability or Erasure at branched states requires further justification, which we attempt in our Compatibility axiom.
12. The formal statements of Macrostate Indifference and Reward Preservation (Wallace's Branching Indiference) differ much from what he describes and justifies.
13. Macrostate Indifference is not needed, and part of Walace's Diachronic Consistency follows from State Supervenience.
14. There are also miscelaneous difficulties with Erasure, Macrostate Indifference and State Supervenience.

Even if all problems can be solved and Wallace's result is correct, it does not mean Born weights are an Everettian agent's subjective probabilities. His proof is not based on such concept, at least not in Savage's decision theoretic sense. Born weights are objective parameters the agent uses to decide, formally in the same way a classical agent uses probabilities. But as he knows all branches exist, the meaning he attributes to such weights can not be probabilistic (as seen in section 2.3, appeals to self-locating uncertainty do not seem valid). Interpreting his reasons, in a possibly quite distinct Universe, in terms of our familiar concepts (call it subjective probability, credence or degree of belief), would be a huge extrapolation.

A Classical decision theory

Decision Theory [PI09, Kar14] is an interdisciplinary area of study, concerned, among other things, with developing principles to optimize decision making. Decision problems are usually framed in terms of an agent having to establish a *preference order* $\succ$ on lotteries. A *lottery*

$$A = \{(p_i, r_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \tag{9}$$

consists of a set $\mathcal{O}$ of mutually exclusive *outcomes*, each having probability p_i and giving a *reward* r_i.

Each reward r can be identified with a *simple lottery*, which gives it with certainty as its unique reward. An order on lotteries induces another on rewards. If all rewards are equally preferred, the problem is trivial. Otherwise, we assume[22] the existence of least and most preferred rewards, labeled as r_0 and r_1.

Given lotteries A and B, and $t \in [0,1]$, a *compound lottery* $tA + (1-t)B$ is one in which the probability of each reward is $tp_A + (1-t)p_B$, where p_A and p_B are its probabilities in A and B. Equivalently, it is a lottery in which the agent first chooses randomly to bet on A or B, with probabilities t and $1-t$ respectively. For each $t \in [0,1]$ we define a *standard lottery of weight t* as

$$L_t = (1-t)r_0 + tr_1. \tag{10}$$

---

[22] This is just for simplicity, the theory can be adapted to work without such extremal rewards.

A.1 Decision under certainty

In *Decision under Certainty*, each lottery has a unique outcome. The agent's preference is *rational* (in a strictly decision theoretic sense) if it is a total order, i.e. it satisfies, for any lotteries A, B, and C:

Completeness. *Either $A \succ B$, or $B \succ A$, or $A \sim B$.*

Transitivity. *If $A \succcurlyeq B$ and $B \succcurlyeq C$ then $A \succcurlyeq C$.*

A.2 Decision under risk

In *Decision under Risk*, lotteries have multiple outcomes, with known probabilities. A crude strategy uses the Expected Value of lotteries, i.e. the average value of the rewards, weighted by probabilities. This seems reasonable, by the Law of Large Numbers, but can lead to unreasonable results, like the St. Petersburg Paradox, when the number of runs is finite. A more flexible strategy, proposed in 1738 by D. Bernoulli [Ber54], replaces monetary values by an *utility function* $u(r)$ on rewards, leading to the following strategy.

Principle of Maximization of Expected Utility. *The preference order $\succ$ is induced by $u(r)$ according to $A \succ B \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{EU}(A) > \mathrm{EU}(B)$, where the* expected utility EU *of $A = \{(p_i, r_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{O}}$ is*

$$\mathrm{EU}(A) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} p_i \cdot u(r_i). \tag{11}$$

Given a preference order $\succ$ and an utility function u, $\succ$ is induced by u if, and only if, the following *Axioms of Utility* are satisfied, for any rewards r, r' and r'':

Axiom U1. *If $r \succ r'$ then $u(r) > u(r')$, and if $r \sim r'$ then $u(r) = u(r')$.*

Axiom U2. *If $r'' \sim tr + (1-t)r'$ then $u(r'') = t \cdot u(r) + (1-t) \cdot u(r')$.*

Any $\succ$ which is induced by some u satisfies Completeness, Transitivity, and also:

Independence. *If $A \succ B$ then $tA + (1-t)C \succ tB + (1-t)C$, for any $t \in (0, 1]$.*

Archimedean Property. *If $A \succ B \succ C$, there are $s, t \in (0, 1)$ such that $tA + (1-t)C \succ B \succ sA + (1-s)C$.*

Independence means a preference between compound lotteries is based only on components that are different. By the Archimedean Property, no lottery is so incommensurately better (resp. worse) than other, that it is impossible to reverse preferences by compounding it appropriately with a worse (resp. better) one. It also means that sufficiently small changes in a lottery do not alter significantly the order.

These four properties define rationality for Decision under Risk, and imply the following ones:

Substitutability. *If $A \sim B$ then $tA + (1-t)C \sim tB + (1-t)C$, for any $t \in [0, 1]$;*

Monotonicity. *If $A \succ B$ then $tA + (1-t)B$ is more preferable for higher values of t;*

Continuity. *If $A \succ B \succ C$ there is a unique $t \in (0, 1)$ such that $B \sim tA + (1-t)C$.*

The importance of the Principle of Maximization of Expected Utility became clear in 1944, when Von Neumann and Morgenstern [VNM44] proved that any rational preference order can be obtained from it.

Von Neumann-Morgenstern Theorem (VNM). *If a preference order $\succ$ satisfies Completeness, Transitivity, Independence and the Archimedean Property, it can be induced by an utility function*[23].

Proof. Completeness and Transitivity mean lotteries are ordered in a single chain without loops, and, by the Archimedean Property, no lottery is infinitely better or worse than other. So $\succ$ can be described by a correspondence between lotteries and real numbers. By Monotonicity, preference on standard lotteries L_t increases with t. By Continuity, for any reward r there is a unique $t \in [0,1]$ such that $r \sim L_t$, and we set $u(r) = t$. As each reward r of a lottery A is equivalent to $L_{u(r)}$, by Substitutability A is equivalent to $L_{EU(A)}$. Thus, preference on lotteries increases with their Expected Utilities. $\square$

A.3 Decision under uncertainty

In *Decision under Uncertainty*, there are multiple possible outcomes, but their probabilities are unknown. Instead of lotteries, problems are usually framed in terms of a preference order on *acts* which, depending on possible *states of the world*, will lead to *payoffs* (consequences).

Some decision strategies (*maximax*, *maximin*, *minimax regret*, etc.) focus on best or worst cases. These are useful in some situations, but can lead to absurd results in others, as they disregard important data, like non-extremal payoffs, or the low likelihoods of some states of the world.

Another strategy uses subjective probabilities, estimates by the agent of the likelihoods of states of the world. But the decision can be very sensitive to the estimates used, especially if there are unlikely states giving huge payoffs. Despite this, L. Savage [Sav72] proved, in 1954, that any preference order satisfying certain axioms can be induced, as before, by some utility function and subjective probabilities.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of states of the world. Not all details of a state are relevant, so we consider *events*, subsets of states with some common characteristic. For example, the event $E =$"it rains tomorrow" consists of all states in which this happens. Events can be partitioned into smaller ones, e.g. E could have subevents "it rains tomorrow and stock prices go up" and "it rains tomorrow and the result of a die is 3". They can be combined using logical operators such as AND, OR, NOT.

An *act* is a function $f : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of payoffs, so that $f(s) = x$ means x is the payoff resulting from act f if the state of world happens to be s. Each payoff x is identified with a *simple act*, which results x for all states. Given acts f and g, and an event E, we define a new act $[f, E; g]$ by

$$[f, E; g](s) = \begin{cases} f(s) & \text{if } s \in E, \\ g(s) & \text{if } s \notin E. \end{cases}$$

Savage adopts, for a preference order $\succ$ on acts, the following axioms, which are usually taken as mandates of rationality for decision under uncertainty.

Axiom S1 (Nondegeneracy). *There are payoffs x, y such that $x \succ y$.*

Axiom S2. *$\succ$ is complete and transitive.*

Axiom S3 (Sure-Thing Principle). *For any event E and acts f, g, h and k, we have $[f, E; h] \succcurlyeq [g, E; h] \Leftrightarrow [f, E; k] \succcurlyeq [g, E; k]$.*

---

[23] Unique up to positive affine transformations $u \mapsto au + b$, for real constants $a > 0$ and b.

This is similar to Independence: preference between acts depends only on the events where they differ. It allows us to define, for each event E, a conditional preference order $\underset{E}{\succ}$ by

$$f \underset{E}{\succ} g \text{ if and only if } [f, E; h] \succ [g, E; h] \text{ for all } h,$$

meaning "f is preferable to g given E", i.e. if the agent assumes E will happen he will prefer f to g.

An event E is *null* if $f \underset{E}{\sim} g$ for all f and g. The idea is that the agent does not believe E can happen, so he does not care about the acts on E. Nullity has the following properties, for events E and F:

Classical Null Subevent. *If E is null, and $F \subset E$, then F is null.*

Classical Null Disjunction. *If E and F are null then $E \cup F$ is null.*

They result from properties of sets and functions, like the fact that a function can be redefined in a subset, without affecting the complement. We prove the last one, for comparison with the quantum case.

Proof. Given any acts f, g and h, define a new act k by

$$k(s) = \begin{cases} g(s) & \text{if } s \in E, \\ f(s) & \text{if } s \in F - E, \\ h(s) & \text{if } s \notin E \cup F. \end{cases}$$

As E is null, $[f, E \cup F; h] \sim k$, and as F is null, $k \sim [g, E \cup F; h]$. The result follows from S2. ☐

Axiom S4. *For any payoffs x and y, and any non null event E, we have $x \underset{E}{\succ} y \Leftrightarrow x \succ y$.*

Hence the agent's preference on payoffs does not depend on which event leads to them.

Axiom S5. *Let x, y, z and w be payoffs, and E, F be events. If $x \succ y$ and $z \succ w$, then $[x, E; y] \succ [x, F; y] \Leftrightarrow [z, E; w] \succ [z, F; w]$.*

The intuitive idea is as follows. $[x, E; y]$ gives a better payoff in case of E than otherwise. $[x, F; y]$ gives the same payoffs, but the event giving the good payoff is F instead of E. By S4 the agent only cares about the payoff and not how he got it, so the only reason for preferring $[x, E; y]$ to $[x, F; y]$ is that he thinks E is more likely than F. So the same preference should hold for any pair z, w of good/bad payoffs.

This induces an order on events by

$$E \succ F \text{ if and only if } [x, E; y] \succ [x, F; y] \text{ whenever } x \succ y.$$

It means the agent thinks E is more likely than F, as he prefers the better reward be given in case of E than in case of F. Savage proves this order is a *qualitative probability* (see [Sav72] for definition and proof) on events. The next axiom allows it to turn into a quantitative one.

Axiom S6. *If $f \succ g$ then for any payoff x there is a finite partition $\mathcal{S} = \cup_{i=1}^{n} E_i$ such that $[x, E_i; f] \succ g$ and $f \succ [x, E_i; g]$ for every i.*

This is similar to the Archimedean Property. It means the set of states of the world can be decomposed in events E_i deemed so unlikely that changing the payoff on one of them is not enough to alter preferences. And no payoff is infinitely good or bad, or it would alter preferences for any non null E_i. The partition could be given, for example, by the results of a roulette with a huge number of slots.

Savage extends this to events, proving that if $F \succ E$ there is a finite partition $\mathcal{S} = \uplus_{i=1}^{n} E_i$ such that $F \succ E \cup E_i$ for any i. Some E_i's may be deemed more likely than others, but, after some technical work, he obtains partitions whose events the agent considers equally likely. Then it is straightforward to obtain probabilities. Partitioning $\mathcal{S}$ into n equally likely events, we attribute to each a subjective probability $\frac{1}{n}$. If, for a large n, the minimum number of these pieces needed to cover some event E is m, its subjective probability should be close to $\frac{m}{n}$. The exact value is defined via a limiting process.

Once we have the agent's subjective probabilities, the problem is reduced to a decision under risk.

A final axiom is needed for situations with infinitely many payoffs. It requires that if f is preferred, given E, to all payoffs g can give in such event, then f is preferred to g given E.

Axiom S7. *If* $f \underset{E}{\succ} g(s)$ *for any* $s \in E$*, then* $f \underset{E}{\succ} g$ *(and likewise for* $\underset{E}{\prec}$*).*

References

[AL88] D. Albert and B. Loewer, *Interpreting the many worlds interpretation*, Synthese **77** (1988), no. 2, 195–213.

[Alb10] D. Albert, *Probability in the everett picture*, Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory & Reality (S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, and D. Wallace, eds.), Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 355–368.

[Ass11] A.V.D.B. Assis, *On the nature of* $a_k * a_k$ *and the emergence of the born rule*, Ann. Phys. **523** (2011), no. 11, 883–897.

[AT11] A. Aguirre and M. Tegmark, *Born in an infinite universe: a cosmological interpretation of quantum mechanics*, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011), no. 10, 105002.

[Aul00] G. Auletta, *Foundations and interpretation of quantum mechanics: In the light of a critical-historical analysis of the problems and of a synthesis of the results*, World Scientific Publ., 2000.

[Bak07] D. Baker, *Measurement outcomes and probability in everettian quantum mechanics*, Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. Part B **38** (2007), no. 1, 153–169.

[BCF$^+$00] H. Barnum, C.M. Caves, J. Finkelstein, C.A. Fuchs, and R. Schack, *Quantum probability from decision theory?*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **456** (2000), 1175–1182.

[Ber54] D. Bernoulli, *Exposition of a new theory on the measurement of risk*, Econometrica **22** (1954), no. 1, 22–36.

[BHZ06] R.V. Buniy, S.D.H. Hsu, and A. Zee, *Discreteness and the origin of probability in quantum mechanics*, Phys. Lett. B **640** (2006), no. 4, 219 – 223.

[BVN36] G. Birkhoff and J. Von Neumann, *The logic of quantum mechanics*, Ann. Math. **37** (1936), no. 4, pp. 823–843 (English).

[CS13] S.M. Carroll and C.T. Sebens, *Many worlds, the Born rule, and self-locating uncertainty*, Quantum Theory: a Two-Time Success Story: Yakir Aharonov Festschrift (D. Struppa and J. Tollaksen, eds.), Springer London, Limited, 2013, pp. 157 – 170.

[Deu99] D. Deutsch, *Quantum theory of probability and decisions*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **455** (1999), 3129–3137.

[DG73] B. DeWitt and N. Graham (eds.), *The many-worlds interpretation of quantum mechanics*, Princeton University Press, 1973.

[DK96] F. Dowker and A. Kent, *On the consistent histories approach to quantum mechanics*, J. Stat. Phys. **82** (1996), no. 5, 1575–1646.

[EGL09] K. Engesser, D.M. Gabbay, and D. Lehmann, *Handbook of quantum logic and quantum structures: Quantum logic*, Handbook of Global Analysis, Elsevier Science, 2009.

[EI57] H. Everett III, *Relative state formulation of quantum mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **29** (1957), no. 3, 454–462.

[Fin09] J. Finkelstein, *Has the born rule been proven?*, `arXiv:quant-ph/0907.2064` (2009).

[Gle57] A.M. Gleason, *Measures on the closed subspaces of a hilbert space*, J. Math. Mech. **6** (1957), no. 6, 885–893.

[GMH90] M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle, *Quantum mechanics in the light of quantum cosmology*, Complexity, entropy and the physics of information (W.H. Zurek, ed.), Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1990, pp. 425–458.

[GMH93] ———, *Classical equations for quantum systems*, Phys. Rev. D **47** (1993), 3345–3382.

[Gra73] N. Graham, *The measurement of relative frequency*, The Many Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics (B. DeWitt and N. Graham, eds.), Princeton University Press, 1973, pp. 229–253.

[Gri84] R.B. Griffiths, *Consistent histories and the interpretation of quantum mechanics*, J. Stat. Phys. **36** (1984), no. 1, 219–272.

[Gri93] ———, *Consistent interpretation of quantum mechanics using quantum trajectories*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993), 2201–2204.

[Gri02] ———, *Consistent quantum theory*, Cambrigde University Press, 2002.

[Han03] R. Hanson, *When worlds collide: Quantum probability from observer selection?*, Found. Phys. **33** (2003), no. 7, 1129–1150.

[Jan16] L. Jansson, *Everettian quantum mechanics and physical probability: Against the principle of state supervenience*, Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. Part B **53** (2016), 45–53.

[JZK$^+$03] E. Joos, H.D. Zeh, C. Kiefer, D.J.W. Giulini, J. Kupsch, and I.O. Stamatescu, *Decoherence and the appearance of a classical world in quantum theory*, Springer, 2003.

[Kar14] E. Karni, *Axiomatic foundations of expected utility and subjective probability*, Handbook of the Economics of Risk and Uncertainty (M. Machina and K. Viscusi, eds.), vol. 1, North-Holland, 2014, pp. 1 – 39.

[Ken10] A. Kent, *One world versus many: the inadequacy of everettian accounts of evolution, probability, and scientific confirmation*, Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory & Reality (S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, and D. Wallace, eds.), Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 369–390.

[Ken15] ———, *Does it make sense to speak of self-locating uncertainty in the universal wave function? Remarks on Sebens and Carroll*, Found. Phys. **45** (2015), no. 2, 211–217.

[Mal08] J. Mallah, *Decision theory is a red herring for the many worlds interpretation*, `arXiv:quant-ph/0808.2415` (2008).

[Man17] A. Mandolesi, *Non-probabilistic decoherent histories and the preferred basis problem in everettian quantum mechanics*, `arXiv:quant-ph/1704.01173` (2017).

[Mau14] T. Maudlin, *Critical study David Wallace, The emergent multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett interpretation. Oxford University Press, 2012, 530 + xv pp.*, Noûs **48** (2014), no. 4, 794–808.

[Omn88] R. Omnès, *Logical reformulation of quantum mechanics. I. Foundations*, J. Stat. Phys. **53** (1988), no. 3, 893–932.

[Omn99] ———, *Understanding quantum mechanics*, Princeton University Press, 1999.

[PI09] G. Parmigiani and L. Y. T. Inoue, *Decision theory: principles and approaches*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester and UK, 2009.

[Pol01] L Polley, *Position eigenstates and the statistical axiom of quantum mechanics*, Foundations of Probability and Physics, vol. 1, 2001, pp. 314–320.

[Pri06] H. Price, *Probability in the Everett world: Comments on Wallace and Greaves*, `arXiv:quant-ph/0604191` (2006).

[Pri10] ———, *Decisions, decisions, decisions: can savage salvage everettian probability?*, Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory & Reality (S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, and D. Wallace, eds.), Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 369–390.

[Sau10] S. Saunders, *Chance in the everett interpretation*, Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory & Reality (S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, and D. Wallace, eds.), Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 181–205.

[Sav72] L. Savage, *The foundations of statistics*, 2 ed., Dover, New York, 1972.

[SC16] C.T. Sebens and S.M. Carroll, *Self-Locating Uncertainty and the Origin of Probability in Everettian Quantum Mechanics*, Br J Philos Sci **axw004** (2016).

[Sch07] M.A. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence: and the quantum-to-classical transition*, The Frontiers Collection, Springer, 2007.

[Vai98] L. Vaidman, *On schizophrenic experiences of the neutron or why we should believe in the many-worlds interpretation of quantum theory*, Int. Stud. Philos. Sci. **12** (1998), no. 3, 245–261.

[VNM44] J. Von Neumann and O. Morgenstern, *Theory of games and economic behavior*, Princeton University Press, 1944.

[Wal03] D. Wallace, *Everettian rationality: defending deutsch's approach to probability in the everett interpretation*, Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. Part B **34** (2003), 415–439.

[Wal07] ———, *Quantum probability from subjective likelihood: improving on deutsch's proof of the probability rule*, Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. Part B **38** (2007), 311–332.

[Wal10] ———, *How to prove the born rule*, Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory & Reality (S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, and D. Wallace, eds.), Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 227–263.

[Wal12] ———, *The emergent multiverse: Quantum theory according to the everett interpretation*, Oxford University Press, 2012.

[Wil13] A. Wilson, *Objective probability in everettian quantum mechanics*, Br J Philos Sci **64** (2013), no. 4, 709.

[WZ14] J.A. Wheeler and W.H. Zurek, *Quantum theory and measurement*, Princeton Series in Physics, Princeton University Press, 2014.

[Zur02] W. Zurek, *Decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical - revisited*, Los Alamos Science **27** (2002), 86–109.

[Zur05] W.H. Zurek, *Probabilities from entanglement, born's rule* $p_k = \mid \psi_k \mid^2$ *from envariance*, Phys. Rev. A **71** (2005), 052105.